```
1
                           UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.
                           DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY.
 2
                           CIVIL ACTION NO. 83-2864 SA
 3
    ANTONIO CIPOLLONE,
    individually and as Executor
    of the Estate of
    ROSE D. CIPOLLONE,
                Plaintiff,
 7
          VS.
                                       DEXTER NEADLE
    LIGGETT GROUP, INC., a
    Delaware corporation; PHILIP
    MORRIS INCORPORATED, a Virginia:
    corporation; LOEW'S THEATRES,
    INC., a New York corporation,
11
                Defendants.
12
13
14
          TRANSCRIPT of testimony as taken by and
    before MARGARET J. TEILHABER, & Certified
15
    Shorthand Reporter and Motary Public of the State
15
17
    of New Jersey, at the offices of WEBSTER &
    SHEFFIELD, 237 Park Avenue, New York, New York,
18
19
    on Monday, October 26, 1987.
            ARANCES:
20
21
          BUDD, LARNER, GROSS, PICILLO, ROSENBAUM,
22
          GREENBERG & SADE
          150 John F. Kennedy Parkway
          Short Hille, New Jersey
23
          BY: MARC Z. EDELL, ESQ.
          For the Plaintiff
24
25
```

```
2
          WEBSTER & SHEFFIELD
          237 Park Avenue
3.
          New York, New York 10017
               JAMES V. KEARNEY, ESQ.
               JAMES H. GIANNINOTO, ESQ.
          For Liggett Group, Inc.
          SHOOK, HARDY & BACON .
          20th Floor
          Mercantile Bank Tower
 7 :
          1101 Walnut
          Kansas City, Missouri
 ALLEN R. PURVIS, ESQ.
          For Philip Morrie, Inc. and Lorillard, Inc.
 9
          BROWN, CONNERY, KULP, WILLE,
10
          PURNELL & GREENE
          Parkade Building
11
          518 Market Street
          P.O. BOX 1449
          Canden, New Jersey 08101
12
          BY: DENNIS P. BLAKE, ESQ.
13
          For Philip Morris, Inc.
14
          ARNOLD & PORTER
          1200 New Rampshire Avenue, N.W.
          Washington, D.C. 20036
15
                PETER K. BLEAKLEY, ESQ.
                THOMAS B. SILFEN, ESQ.
16
          For Philip Morrie, Inc. .
17
          STRYKER, TAMS & DILL
18
          33 Washington Street
          Newark, New Jersey
                                07102
              WILLIAM TUCKER, ESQ.
19
               JEANNE SZAFRANOWSKI, ESQ.
          For Lorillard, Inc.
20
21
22
23
```

24

2.5

Ŋ	
0	
1	
• 1	
()	
*	
(2)	
Ā	
6	
_	

			•
1		INDEX	
.2	WITNESS	DIRECT	•
3	DEXTER NEA	DLE	
4	Mr. Ede	11 6	•
. 5			
6			
7			
_	<u>.</u>	BXHIBITS	
8	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION IDENT:	FICATION
9	Neadle-1	Two-page blank	43
10		smoking study	70
11	Neadle-2	Two-page document entitled Interviewer	43
12	f :	Specifications	
13	Neadle-3	(Exhibit number not used)	
14	Neadle-4	Two-page document	43
15		entitled All Other Responses	
16	Neadle-5	Four-page handwritten document number 4906	43
17	Neadle-6	9-page handwritten document	43
18		starting with word	,
19	Neadle-7	7-page handwritten document	
20		yaya nanawrittan document	43
-	Neadle-8	Six pages, top page	43
21		handwritten, dated 7-25-85	•
22	Neadle-9	16 pages, draft, A Survey About Smoking, September 1988	97
23	Neadle-10	29-page document entitled	98
24		A Survey About Smoking	••
25		•	

1		EXHIBITS	
2		(Continued)	
3	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION IDEN	<u>TIPICATION</u>
4	Neadle-11	Four-page document entitled Smoking Study	••
5	Neadle-12	Four-page emoking study re	105
5		Mre. Lee (retained by Mr. Silfen)	-
7	Neadle-13	16-page document entitled	129
8		Audits & Surveys, #4918, Smoking Study	
9	Neadle-14		
10	Margia	7-page document entitled Smoking Study, 10-88	129
11	Neadle-15	Four-page document entitled Smoking Study, handwritten	132
12.		on first three pages	
13	Neadle-16	Four-page document entitled in handwriting Smoking Study	132
14	•	#4819	
15	Neadle-17	Two-page document starting with Q.1, When I mention	132
16		cigarettee, what comes to your mind?	•
17	Neadle-18	One-page document, Revised	132
18		Results, 8-26-85, Code Revisions, 3508 in handwritin	G
19		next to number 200	•
20	Neadle-19	One-page document entitled Revised Results, 8-26-85,	132
21		Code Revisions, 2585 in	
5 5	•	handwriting next to number 200	•
23	Neadle-20	One-page document entitled Q.3, Among 100 cigarette	132
24		smokers, how many of them do	_
25		you think will get lung cance because they smoke?	F

1		EXHIBITS
2		(Continued)
3	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION IDENTIFICATION
4	Neadle-21	Three-page document entitled 132 Smoking Legal Services
5	Neadle-22 to 26	(Exhibit numbers not used.)
7	Needle-27	One-page document entitled 132 Research Utility, 10-6-80
9	Neadle-28	One-page handwritten document 132 dated 9-10-85
0	Neadle-29	Document entitled Smoking 132 Study #4918, Tables 1 to 39
1 2	Neadle-30	Six-page document entitled 132 Paul CP5 LOGI1 in computer art
3	Neadle-31	One-page document entitled 132 Dexter Neadle
4		
5	· ·	
6		
7		
9		
0		
1	·	
2 2		
3		
2 4		·

25

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07082 201-731-9688

5,

```
2
            [DELETED]
 3
    DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. EDELL:
                Mr. Neadle, my name is Marc Edell.
    introduced ourselves before we began this
    proceeding. I represent the plaintiff. Have you
    ever been deposed before?
10
11
                How many times?
          Q.
          Probably five. Four to six times.
13
          Q.
                Ever as an expert witness?
15
          All of the times.
17
                You don't have any copies of the
    transcripts of those proceedings?
18
          No, I do not.
20
                Do you know the names of the law firms
21
    for whom you testified?
          In depositions?
23
          Arnold & Porter was one.
                                     I don't remember
```

the names of the firms.

D. Neadle - direct

- 1 Q. What cases was it that you testified
- 2 for Arnold & Porter?
- 3 A. In a recent case that's not settled yet.
- 4 Q. It's somewhat descriptive but what
- 5 kind of case? What was the subject matter?
- 6 A. The subject matter was advertising,
- 7 misleading advertising, I guess.
- 8 Q. What kind of advertising?
-); A. I'm not sure I know what you mean by what
- 10 kind. Do you mean the product, the medium or
- 11 what?
- 12 Q. The product.
- 13 A. Analgesice.
- 14 Q. Did you perform any type of study for
- 15 Arnold & Porter with regard to analgesic
- 16 | advertising?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. What type of study did you perform?
- 19 A. I don't think I'm allowed to talk about it
- 20 at this point. The case is not settled. It's an
- 21 ongoing case.
- 22 : Q. Have you testified in deposition?
- 23 A. Yes.
- MR. EDELL: I'm asking that the
- 25 witness advise me as to the nature of the case,

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
D. Neadle - direct
  2
                 MR. SILPEN:
                              The nature of the case
     that he just testified in?
                 MR. EDELL: Yes. What type of study
     he did, how he did it.
                             I want to ask him a whole
     series of questions so I can find out what it was
     about.
                 MR. SILFEN:
                              Is there any kind of
     confidentiality order in place?
 10
                 THE WITHESS:
                              I believe there is.
                 MR. SILPEN:
                              Do you know if that
 11
     covers the deposition?
 12
                 THE WITNESS: I really don't know.
 13
                 MR. SILFER: But you do think there's
 14
     a confidentiality order?
 15
                 THE WITNESS:
                               Yes, I believe so.
 16
                 MR. SILFEN:
                               You were told that by the
 17
     lawyer?
 18
                 THE WITNESS:
                               They had me sign a
 19
 20
     confidentiality agreement.
                 MR. SILFEN: Obviously I can find out
. 21
     what the confidentiality agreement is from people
     in my office but until I find out, why don't we
     skip over it.
                 with whom did you work with Arnold &
 25
           Q.
```

```
9
    D. Neadle - direct
    Porter on this analgesic advertising matter?
 2
          The attorney's name was Jack Lipson.
                Was it an administrative proceeding or
       it a civil action?
          I'm not sure I know the difference between
                Can you tell me whether or not it was
    in conjunction with something that the Federal
    Trade Commission was doing?
          No, it was not.
                Is it between private parties?
12
          Yes.
                Who are the parties?
          American Home Products and Johnson &
    Johnson.
                Who does Arnold & Porter represent in -
16
          Q.
    that matter?
17
18
          American Home Products.
                Where is the case pending?
19
20
          In New York, federal court.
21
                Do you know who represents Johnson &
    Johnson?
22
          Patterson, Belknap and comething.
```

These other matters that you've

testified in as an expert witness, you don't

	D. Neadle - direct
1	remember any of the law firms involved?
2	A. No, I do not.
3	Q. Do you remember what types of matters
4	the cases involved?
5	A. One was trademark secondary meaning case.
6	Two of them were trademark cases. Not one, two.
7	Q. What work did you do with regard to
	this trademark matter?
9	A. I conducted surveys.
10	Q. What kinds of surveys?
11	A. Surveys of association of particular brand
1 2	with other products.
13	Q. What brands were involved?
14	A. One was a power tool product. Actually it
15	was something you attach to power tools, an
16	attachment for power drille.
17	Q. You don't know the name of the company
1 8	that was involved?
19	A. Global Tool Company.
20	Q. Where was that case pending?
21	A. In Florida and in California.
22	Q. What other cases were you involved in?
2 3	A. One involving the television program, The
24	Greatest American Hero.

What was your involvement in that

Q.

25

- D. Neadle direct
- 2 A. I did a survey.
- 3 Q. What kind of survey?
- 4 A. A survey on association of The Greatest
- 5 | American Hero with other movie characters and
- 6 other entertainment vehicles.
- 7 Q. For whom were you performing the
- # survey?
- 9 A. For whoever owns the trademark rights to
- 10 | Superman. I don't remember.
- 11 Q. Where is that case pending?
- 12 A. In New York federal court.
- 13 Q. What are the other matters you
- 14 testified in as an expert witness?
- 15 A. I'm sorry. When you say testify, are you
- 16 referring only to depositions?
- 17 Q. You've told me you testified four to
- 18 six times in depositions. Is that right?
- 19 A. Yes. I don't remember the other cases with
- 20 depositions.
- 21 Q. Apparently you've testified in either
- 22 trials or administrative proceedings?
 - S A. Yes.
- 24 Q. How many times have you done that?
- 25 A. Probably about five times as well.

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 Q. For whom?
- 2 A. For Virginia National Bank in an antitrust
- 3 case, for the Coca-Cola Foods Division in a
- 4 | misleading advertising case, for Global Tool in
- 5 the same case I mentioned before about power
- 5 | tools, for the Pillebury Company in an antitrust
- 7
- 8 Q. Did any of those cases involve Arnold
- 9 & Porter?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Which ones?
- 12 A. Virginia National Bank and Coca-Cola Foods.
- 13 Q. You don't have any of the transcripts
- 14 from those proceedings?
- 15 A. No, I do not.
- Q. Who are the lawyers involved in those
 - 17 cases at Arnold & Porter?
 - 18 A. In the Virginia National Bank, it was Harry
 - 19 | Kats and I believe Worthheimer. I'm not sure if I
 - 20 have that name right. In Coca-Cola Foods, this is
 - 21 a number of years ago. I don't remember the names
 - 22 of the attorneys. Stuart Land was one but I don't
 - 23 remember the names of the others that I worked
 - 24 with directly.

25

Q. What is Medimetric Institute?

```
p. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 A. Medimetric Institute was, I don't believe it
- 2 is any more, it was a marketing research
- 3 organization which specialized in research in the
- 4 ethical pharmaceutical market and was a subsidiary
- 5 of an advertising agency which had the same
- 6 specialization.
- 7 Q. When did you work for them?
- 8 A. 1952 I believe I worked for them part time
- 9 and starting in 1953 through either the end of
- 10 1956, around the end of 1956 on a full-time basis.
- 11 Q. Did any of the work that you did at
- 12 Medimetric Institute concern the public's attitude
- 13 with regard to health issues?
- 14 | A. No, it did not.
- 15 Q. What work did you do?
- 16 A. I did studies of pharmacists, physicians and
- . 17 other health professionals.
 - 18 Q. What types of studies?
 - 19 A. Studies of pharmacists were basically
 - 20 | concerned with prescription volume by brand and
 - 21 type of drug and the studies with physicians
 - 22 concerned a variety of therapies and size and
 - 23 scope of their practices.
 - 24 . Q. When did you get your B.B.A.?
 - 25 A. In 1953.

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 Q. On the resume that was provided to me,
- 2 it has receiving an NBA.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 ; Q. What is an NBA?
- 5 A. MBA. M as in Mary.
- 6 Q. It says W as in Nancy on the resume.
- 7 A. Sorry. It's a typo. It's an MBA.
- Q. When did you get that?
- 9 A. I believe it was 1961.
- 10 Q. Did you have any full-time employment
- 11 | prior to 1952?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. What was that?
- 14 'A. I worked on a full-time basis for some Wall
- 15 Street brokerage houses.
- 16 | Q. When was that?
- 17 A. From about 1946 to about 1950.
- 18 Q. What did you do?
- 19 A. I was head runner and a stock transfer clerk
- 20 and then I worked in IBM, the IBM department in
- 21 the precomputer days when there was punch card
- 22 tabulating equipment.
- 23 . Q. What did you do after you left working
- 24 ; for these brokerage firms?
- 25 A. I basically had been going to college at

- D. Neadle direct
- night and I switched to going to college during
- the day to try to finish and worked part time.
- What did you do in 1956 after you left Medimetric Institute?
- 5 I went to Opinion Research Corporation.
- In Princeton?
- 7 Yes.
- Q. Why did you leave Medimetric
- Institute?
- 10 I felt it was a greater opportunity and a
- 11 more generalized kind of research operation than
- one limited to one industry. 12
- 13 What did you do for the Opinion
- Research Corporation? 14
- a survey director and then was 15
- 16
- 17 What were your responsibilities
- survey director? 18
- To direct eurvey projects. 19
- 20 Did you plan projecte?
- 21 Yes.
- 22 You would plan the surveys?
- 23
- 24
- 25 : A.

- D. Neadle direct
- How long did you work for Opinion 1 Q.
- Research Corporation?
- Until I joined Audits & Surveys at the end
- of 1962 so that would be six or seven years.
- During that period of time did you do
- any work for any cigarette manufacturer?
- Not that I recall.
- Did you do any work for any trade Q.
- association of any cigarette manufacturers?
- Not that I recall.
- Did you do any work for any 11
- advertising companies that represented cigarette
- manufacturers? 13
- I assume you mean on their cigarette
- accounts. 15
- 16 Q. Yes.
- No, I did not. 17
- Do you know whether Opinion Research 18
- Corporation itself during that period of time did 19
- work for any digarette manufacturers?
- 21 It's possible. I'm not specifically aware
- of any they did but it's possible. 22
- Why do you say it's possible? 23
- They had a lot of clients. I don't recall
- them all but it's 25 years ago that I left the

2017010862

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 company.
- ? | Q. Did you specialize in any type of
- 3 survey?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. Did you perform any survey which
- 6 concerned attitudes of the public concerning any
- 7 health hazards during that period of time? Again
- * we are talking 1986 to 1962.
- 9 A. Not that I can recall specifically
- 10 : concerning health hazards, no.
- Q. Did any of the surveys in any way
- 12 relate to the public's opinion concerning any
- 13 health hazards7
- 14 A. I don't believe so.
- 18 Q. Why did you leave Opinion Research
- 16 Corporation?
- 17 A. For a higher salary and what I thought was a
- 18 better job.
- 19 Q. You went to Audits & Surveys, Inc.?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 ! Q. What did you do there? Again we are
- 22 talking about 1962.
- 23 A. My original job was manager of operations
- 24 for their national audit division.
- 25 Q. What were your responsibilities in

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 | that capacity?
- 2 A. To be responsible for design, execution and
- 3 | costing of national audit projects.
- Q. What's an audit?
- 5 A. An audit in a research sense in a
- 6 | measurement of retail eales.
- 7 Q. Now do you go about performing an
- 8 audit7
- 9 A. You measure the retail sales of selected
- 10 products in a sample of retail stores and combine
- 11 that data to come up with estimates for some
- 12 specific population or universe that that wample
- 13 represents of volume, brand shares, inventory
- 14 ilevele, distribution.
- 15 Q. Were you involved in opinion surveys
- 16 at that time?
- 17 iA. Only on a part-time basis working with other
- 18 divisions of the company.
- 19 Q. Now long did you remain in this
- 20 position? I forgot how you described it, whatever
- 21 it was.
- 22 A. Manager of audit operations.
- 23 Q. How long did you remain as manager of
- 24 | audit operations?
- 25 A. Until I moved into the survey division in

1969 full time. 1

- 2 Did you receive any formal training in 3 the conducting of opinion surveys?
- Yes.
- Q. Where did you receive that formal training?
- 7 At City College of New York.
- What were your courses that you took in that regard?
- 10 I'm trying to recall. It's a long time
- 11 There was over thirty credits in the
- statistics department, some of which were survey
- research courses such as marketing research, case
- studies and marketing research, advertising
- I believe there was one on case studies research.
- 16 and questionnaire design. A course in probability
- 17 sampling. There were basic courses in statistics
- as applied to surveys, analysis of variance. 18
- don't recall the others. 19
- 20 Q. Did you recall any other formal
- 21 treining?
- Not in an educational institution, no. 22
- 23 Do you recall any other formal
- training?
- 25 I've attended many research conferences

- D. Needle direct
- 1 which I've listened to speeches and seminars by
- 2 people, talks and seminars by people on various
- 3 aspects of survey research.
- 4 . Q. Prior to 1969, were you aware as to
- 5 whether or not Audits & Surveys, Inc. had ever
- 6 done any work for any cigarette manufacturer?
- 7 A. Yes, it had.
- Q, What type of work had it done?
- A. It had done distribution studies for tobacco
- 10 companies.
- 11 Q. What do you mean by distribution
- 12 studies?
- 13 A. These are measurements of the availability
- 14 of epecific brands, the degree of availability of
- 15 specific brands in various retail channels.
- 16 Q. What was the purpose of those studies?
- 17 A. To inform the manufacturers as to how good
- 18 or bad their distribution was in total and by
- 19 various subclasses of the distribution system.
- 20 Q. When were those studies being carried
- 21 017
- 22 A. During the 1960s.
- 23 . Q, is that the only work that you can
- 24 recall prior to 1969 that Audits & Surveys, Inc.
- 25 did for any digarette manufacturer?

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 A. That's the only ones I'm aware of.
- 2 Q. Are you aware as to whether or not
- 3 Audits & Surveys, Inc. did any work for any of the
- 4 | cigarette manufacturers' trade associations?
- 5 A. To the best of my knowledge, they did not.
- 6 Q. Did Audite & Surveys do any work for
- 7 any advertising companies?
- & A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Do you know whether it did any work
- 10 for any advertising companies which represented
- 11 cigarette manufacturers? Again it would be
- 12 cigarette-related research.
- 13 A. Only to the extent I've testified about the
- 14 tobacco companies before. I don't know of any
- 15 other research that was done on cigarettes.
- 16 Q. When was it that the state of the art
- 17 of opinion research surveys was such that a
- 18 cigarette manufacturer could have conducted a
- 19 study to ascertain the level of awareness that its
- 20 consumers had concerning cigarette smoking and
- 21 health?
- 22 MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of
- 23 the question. Would you read it back.
- 24; {Question read.}
- 25 A. I believe I believe they could have

:	D. Neadle - direct
1	conducted surveys like that 60, 70 years ago.
2	Q. 1920e7
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. 1930e?
8	A. Yes.
6	Q. 1910e7
7	A. I don't know. I would have to read up on
8	some of the history as to when opinion surveys
9	started in the more formal sense. Opinion surveys
10	go back to before the United States was formed.
11	Q. Did Audits & Surveys, Inc. ever do any
12	work for cigarette manufacturers concerning the
13	public's awareness concerning the health hazards
14	of cigarette emoking other than the work you
15	performed here in this case?
16	A. Not that I'm aware of.
17	Q. Do you know whether or not Audite &
18	Surveys, Inc. ever did any opinion surveys with
19	regard to any health issue and the public's
20	awareness of that issue?
	I a series and a series as able

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 Q. Can you tell us what the subjects of
- 2 those studies were?
- 3 h. We've done's survey about mine safety, coal
- 4 mines. We have done a survey about natural
- 5 hazarde.
- 6 Q. What do you mean by natural hazards?
- 7 A. Fire, flood, windstorm, hurricanes. We have
- 8 done a survey about packaging safety with regard
- \$ | to pharmaceutical products.
- 10 Q. Is that 1t?
- 11 A. Those are the only ones I can think of.
- 12 . Q. When was the survey with regard to
- 13 coal mine safety conducted?
- 14 A. Approximately three years ago.
- 15 Q. By whom?
- 16 A. By Audits & Surveys.
- 17 Q. Were you the person who designed and
- 18 supervised the survey?
- 19 A. No. It was done by someone who works with
- 20 10.
- 21 Q. Did you have any participation in that
- -22 | survey?
- 23 A. Not in any substantive way.
- q. For whom did you perform that survey?
- 25 When I say you, I mean Audits & Surveys, Inc.

- D. Needle direct
- 1 A I don't recall who the client was.
- Q. Do you recall for what purpose it was
- 3 performed?
- 4 A. It was performed to determine whether there
- 5 were preconceived notions among the majority of
- 6 the public in some communities about mine safety
- 7 and whose responsibility it was and that was the
- 8 'general topic area.
- 9 Q. Do you recall whether or not you were
- 10 doing it for the mining industry or the government
- 11 or the people in the localities?
- 12 A. I believe the study was done for a law firm.
- 13 Q. What law firm was that?
- 14 A. I'm afraid I don't know.
- 15 Q. How many of Audits & Surveys, Inc. 's
- 16 work is done for law firms?
- 17 A. Relatively small amount. Less than two or
- 18 three percent.
- 19 Q. The study on natural hazards, who was
- 20 | that performed for, eir?
- 21 A. University of Massachusette and they may
- 22 have had a second university connected with it.
- Q. Did you have anything to do with that
- 24 survey?
- 25 A. Yes.

D. Neadle -	direct
-------------	--------

- 1 Q. What was your role in that survey?
- 2 A. The execution of the survey was under my
- 3 responsibility.,
- Q. You didn't design the survey?
- 8 : A. No, I did not.
- 6 Q. What types of surveys were you doing
- 7 back in 19697
- 8 A. Mostly marketing surveys.
- q. What was the purpose of the marketing
- 10 surveye?
- 11 | A. To provide various kinds of marketing
- 12 information to our clients, advertising awareness,
- 13 share, consumer attitudes, consumer behavior
- 14 measurements.
- 15 Q. How do you determine advertising
- 16 awareness?
- 17 i.A. By asking the consumers what they are aware
- 18 of within a specific framework.
- 19 O. What do you mean by within a specific
- 20 framework?
- 21 A. Usually a framework of a product category or
- 22 a product class.
- 23 Q. All you do is ask them a question
- 24 about that particular product's advertising?
- 25 That's a survey?

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 A. That could be a survey. Usually we did it
- 2 in connection with many other measurements about a
- 3 particular product category from the same
- 4 consumers.
- Q. Why is that?
- 5 A. For analytic purposes.
- 7 Q. Before you got your MBA, did you have
- 8 any formal training in opinion surveys?
- 9 Å. Yes.
- 10 Q. What courses did you take and what
- 11 training did you receive?
- 12 A. Similar courses I mentioned earlier were
- 13 taken as part of my MBA. I don't really recall
- 14 Which ones were part of my MBA and which ones were
- 15 part of my bachelor's degree.
- 16 Q. What criteria are there for survey
- 17 research companies to join the Council of American
- 18 : Research Organization?
- 19 A. They have to have been in business a minimum
- 20 of one year. They have to be a for-profit
- 21 | commercial organization. If they are owned by any
- 22 other company or business, they have to operate as
- 23 an independent subsidiary then as in the survey
- 24 : research business. They have to be what we would
- 25 refer to as a full line research company, not just

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 | a field agency, not just a data processing agency,
- 2 not just a consulting agency.
- Q. Are you a member of any professional
- 4 organizations?
- 5 A. Yes, I am.
- 5 Q. What are those?
- 7 A. American Marketing Association and the
- 8 American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 9 Q. There was one paper listed in the
- 10 resume that I was provided. Did you publish any
- 11 other papers other than that one?
- 12 A. I believe there were two listed in the
- 13 resume.
- 14 Q. I'll check and see if I was wrong. I
- 15 see, The Relationship Between Attitude and Product
- 16 Behavior and Drug Salesmen Like Their Jobs.
- 17 Right?
- 18 'A. That's correct.
- 19 Q. Any other publications?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. What qualifies an individual to
- 22 perform survey research? Obviously you don't have
- 23 to have a Ph.D. You are doing it. What qualifies
- 24 somebody to perform such research?
- 25 A. Some combination of education and experience

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 and training.
- Q. What type of education?
- 3 : A. Since opinion research draws on many fields,
- 4 the people who perform opinion research or survey
- 5 research come from a variety of educational
- 6 | backgrounds and the social sciences and the
- 7 mathematical sciences and some from other fields
- 8 | such as liberal arts.
- 9 Q. Are there degrees that one can obtain
- 10 in marketing that specialize in survey research?
- 11 A. Not survey research per se but in marketing
- 12 ; research.
- 13 Q. What schools offer such courses?
- 14 A. City College. It's Baruch College now. It
- 15 was City College when I went to it. University of
- 16 Georgia. There are a number of others that have
- 17 specific programs in marketing research. Hofstra
- 18 has an applied psychology Ph.D. program in which
- 19 one of the areas you can specialize in is
- 20 marketing research and survey research.
- 21 Q. Are there any recognized giants in the
- 22 | field of survey research?
- 23 A. I'm not sure I know what you mean by that.
- Q. Are there people who are considered to
- 25 be the best in the field?

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 A. There are people who are better known than
- 2 others but usually it's in some aspect of survey
- 3 research as opposed to the total area of survey
- 4 'research.
- Q. What about opinion research?
- 5 : A. I classify that as a part of survey
- 7 research.
- 8; Q. Are there any experts that you
- 9 , recognize in opinion research?
- 10 A. As I said, usually they are experts in a
- 11 particular aspect. They might be sampling experts
- 12 or statistical experts. They might be
- 13 questionnaire design experts. They might be data
- 14 processing experts. I don't think somebody is
- 15 known as an expert in, that they are acknowledged
- 16 ! leaders in survey research as a total field.
- 17 Q. Is the design of a survey research a
- 18 specialty in survey research, designing the
- 19 studies?
- 20 A. Again, designing a study usually includes a
- 21 lot of different facets. It includes the sample
- 22 design, it includes the projected analysis, it
- 23 includes the questionnaire design.
- 24 : Q. Which aspect are you an expert in?
- 25 A. I'm a generalist in designing and conducting

```
30
   D. Neadle - direct
   SULAGAS.
                There are no experts who are
    generalists in conducting opinion research
   surveys?
          I believe there are people who are experts
    in the field but there are no what I would call
   acknowledged experts in the total general area.
                There are no acknowledged generalists
          Q.
    as you described it as experts in the field.
    that what you are saying?
11
          That's correct.
               . How do you get paid for your work?
12
          I get a salary from Audite & Surveys.
13
                Straight ealary?
          a.
14
          Plus I'm a stockholder in the company.
15
                The work that you are performing in
16
    this case for Arnold & Porter, that's in the
17
    context of your work with Audits & Surveys:
    that correct?
19
          That's correct.
20
                You are not receiving any additional
21
                             Is that right? Other than
    remuneration for that.
```

You don't get any bonuses or anything

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

your normal salary.

25

That's correct.

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 | like that?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. How much has your company received
- 4 | from Arnold & Porter for conducting your work in
- 5 this matter?
- 6 : A. I don't recall the amount.
- 7 Q. Did you give them a projected budget
- \$ | when 'you sat down to work out this survey for
- 9 them?
- 10 A. At the time of the survey, yes, I believe I
- 11 gave them an estimated cost for the survey.
- 12 | Q. What was the estimated cost of the
- 13 survey at the time?
- 14 A. I don't recall the amount. It was -- I just
- is don't recall the exact amount. I would have to
- 16 look it up.
- 17 Q. Do you remember whether it was \$1,000
- 18 or \$10,000 or \$100,000?
- 19 A. It was less than 100,000, between 50 and
- 20 \$100,000, but I don't recall the exact amount.
- 21 Q. Do you remember whether you went over
- 22 | budget?
- 3 A. No, I don't recall.
- 24 Q. What was the purpose of the study that
- 25 'you performed for Arnold & Porter in this case?

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 A. To determine the degree of awareness among
- 2 the general public of the dangers that have been
- 3 related to sacking.
- 4 Q. What are those dangers?
- 5 A. Various kinds of illnesses.
- 6 Q. I want to know what the dangers are.
- 7 You said that the purpose was to ascertain the
- a level of awareness of the public regarding certain
- 9 dangers and I want to find out what those dangers
- 10 . are.
- 11 A. Dangers of contracting certain illnesses
- 12 among smokers.
- 13 Q. Contracting what illnesses?
- 14 : A. Specifically lung cancer but getting ill or
- 15 sick in general.
- 16 Q. Ill or sick in the form of what
- 17 disease?
- 18 A. I believe lung cancer was the only one we
- 19 specified in the study.
- 20 Q. Why was that?
- 21 A. That was the only one I was asked to find
- 22 · out about specifically.
- 23 Q. Asked to find out by Arnold & Porter?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Is there a specific question that you

```
D. Neadle - direct
   had that they posed to you that had to be answered
    by this survey? I've had a couple of other
   depositions and all these experts tell me it's
    very important to understand the precise question
    that you are looking into when you begin one of
    these surveys.
                             Object to the form of the
7
                MR. SILFEN:
    question.
                MR. EDELL:
                MR. SILPEN:
                              It's already
10
    objectionable.
11
                MR. EDELL:
12
13
                MR. SILFEN:
    objectionable.
                MR. EDELL: Are you going to let me
15
    finish my question, Mr. Silfen?
                             Absolutely.
17
                MR. SILFEN:
                             Before you object?
18
                MR. EDELL:
                Getting back to the question before I
    was interrupted by Mr. Silfen, a number of the
20
    defendants' experts have identified for us the
    importance of the question that one is looking
    into when you are performing one of these opinion
23
    surveys and I want to know the specific question
    that was posed to you by Arnold & Porter to look
```

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 into, sir.
- 2 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 3 the question. You can answer.
- 4 THE WITHESS: That's what I'm trying
- 5 to find out.
- 6 A. We didn't discuss a specific question. We
- 7 discussed issues. I formed the questions.
 - Q. The issues were again?
- 9 A. The degree of awareness of the public of
- 10 | communication about the dangers of smoking and
- 11 association of smoking with lung cancer and I
- 12 believe those were the major issues we talked
- 13 about.
- 14 ! Q. Did you attempt to ascertain the
- is degree of awareness by the public regarding
- 16 | communications from the tobacco industry on the
- 17 issue of cigarette smoking and health?
- 18 A. We did not try to get the degree of
- 19 awareness from any specific course or any single
- 20 source but just as a general thing, what was the
- 21 awareness.
- 22 Q. Awareness with regard to any specific
- 23 statements?
- 24 A. Awareness of the association of smoking with
- 25 illness, as I said.

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- Q. Did you have an understanding as to the purpose that Arnold & Porter was asking that the study be performed?
- 4 . A. That it was to be used in litigation.
- 5; Q. In what way?
- 6 A. I'm afraid you'd have to ask the attorneys
- 7 how they intended to use it.
- g: Q. There were no discussions between you i and the attorneys concerning why they wanted you
- to do this study in terms of this litigation and what they intended to use the study for? No such
- 12 conversations?
- 13 MR. TUCKER: Object to the form of the
- 14 question.
- 15 MR. SILPEN: You can answer.
- 16. THE WITHESS: Could you repeat the
- 17 | question.
- 18 Q. Were there any conversations between
- is you and any of the lawyers, Arnold & Forter or any
- 20 other law firms that are listed on the report that
- 21 you prepared concerning why they were asking you
- 22 to perform this study?
- 23 A. I don't recall anything other than it was to
- 24 be used in litigation.
- 25 Q. What kind of litigation?

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 A. In cases where cigarette companies were
- 2 being sued by either the people who got sick or
- 3 their estates.
- 4 Q. Did you review any research similar to
- 5 that performed by you in this case performed by
- 6 anybody else?
- 7 A. No, I did not.
- a . Q. You didn't review any of the Gallup
- 9 surveys or the Roper studies or the studies
- 10 performed for the Department of Mealth, Education
- 11 & Welfare. Is that correct?
- 12: MR. TUCKER: Object to the form of the
- 13 question.
- 14 A. No, I didn't review any other research on
- 15 this.
- 16 Q. Is there a reason why you didn't do
- 17 that, sir?
- 18 A. I was never asked to.
- 19 Q. You don't think it would have been
- 20 helpful to you in formulating your questions in
- 21 this case to have reviewed any of these other
- 22 surveys? Is that correct?
- 23 MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
- 24 the question.
- 25 . A. No. I don't believe it would have been

```
D. Neadle - direct
 1 helpful for this particular survey.
                Why do you say it wouldn't have been
  helpful for this particular survey?
          There were no objectives of comparing with
5 the results with other surveys, at least not my
 6 understanding of the objectives.
               Who told you that that was not one of
    the objectives?
         No one told me that it was not one of the
10 . objectives.
               It was never stated as one of the
11
         Q.
  objectives.
                How did you formulate that
13
    understanding?
          Because it wasn't one of the objectives that
    was raised.
17
              Is it your testimony that you cannot
          Q.
18 validly relate the results of this study to prior
    studies?
19
20
                MR. SILTEN: Wait a minute. Objection
21 : to the form of the question. It's just --
          Q.
                $1r7
22
                MR. SILFEN: You can answer.
23
                THE WITHESS: Could you repeat the
24
    question.
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

D. Neadle - direct

1

(Question read.)

- 2 A. I didn't testify to that. I haven't looked
- 3 at any other studies. I don't know if this study
- 4 ; is comparable to them or not.
- 5! Q. How would you know? What would you
- 6 | look for in these other studies to ascertain
- 7 whether it would be comparable or not?
- 8 A. I would have to look at the questions in the
- 9 other studies, the design, who was surveyed, how
- 10 ! they were sampled, a whole host of things about
- 11 other studies before I would know whether they are
- 12 comparable or not and in what context the
- 13 questions were asked.
- 14 : Q. What do you mean by in what context
- 15 the questions were asked?
- 16 A. Whether they were preceded by other
- 17 questions on other issues or even other questions
- 18 on related issues.
- Q. How does that affect the studies?
- 20 A. It can affect the results of the questions,
- 21 what's preceding a question.
- Q. How does that happen?
- 23 A. It happens because people's answers are
- 24 different, depending on in what framework a
- 25 question is presented.

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 | Q. Why are they different depending upon
- 2 | the framework in which the questions are asked?
- 3 A. I think you'd have to see a psychologist, an
- 4 expert in consumer psychology for why people's
- 5 answers are different.
- 6 · Q. You just know that they are?
- 7 A. Yee.
- 8 Q. Now do you know that, sir?
- 9: A. From studying and reading in the field.
- 10; Q. How would you as an expert in opinion
- 11 survey research know what order to put the
- 12 questions?
- 13 A. Based on experience plus readings in the
- 14 field.
- 15. Q. What experience have you had in the
- 16 area of performing studies concerning cigarette
- 17 emoking and health?
- 18 A. I've already told you that this was the only
- 19 one about that. However, the principles of a
- 20 ! questionnaire are not really 100 percent
- 21 dependent, or even not dependent, on the subject
- 22 matter per se in terms of principles of
- 23 questionnaire design.
- 24 . Q. What are the principles of
- 25 questionnaire design?

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 A. There are many of them. I couldn't count
- 2 them all now.
- 3 Q. You, tell me the principles are the
- 4 same. What are you referring to?
- 5 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 6 the question.
- Q. Let me just say one thing, Mr.
- 8 | Neadle. I want to protect Mr. Silfen's interests
- 9 but I also want to finish my questions before he
- 10 has to jump in and make his objection so please
- 11 hold your response until he he has had an
- 12 opportunity to put his objection on the record.
- 13 That way he won't interrupt my questions.
- 14 MR. SILFEN: You can disregard any
- 15 advice from Mr. Edell. You just answer
- 16 questions. I'll make my objections. There's an
- 17 objection to the form of the question. Why don't
- 18 you repeat it and keep going.
- 19 (Question read.)
- 20 A. I'm referring to a whole body of knowledge
- 21 about forms of questions and sequences of
- 22 guestions.
- 23 Q. Not specific principles?
- 24 A. I think this body of knowledge encompasses
- 25 many, many, many opinion principles.

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 Q. Tell me about the principles you
- 2 applied in preparing the questionnaire that you
- 3 used in this survey.
- 4 A. I made the questions objective, non-leading
- 5 questions. I designed the questions in such a way
- 6 as to counteract any possibility of sequence bias
- 7 and I asked the questions in a context that I felt
- the general public would understand.
- 9 Q. Now did you test the validity of the
- 10 organization of the questionnaires?
- 11 A. I did a pilot survey.
- 12 Q. What did that pilot survey reveal?
- 13 A. It revealed that the general public appeared
- 14 to understand the questions and were able to
- 15 answer them and that there didn't appear to be any
- 16 confusion among respondents as to what we were
- 17 : trying to attain.
- 18 Q. Did you consult with anyone at
- 19 Audits & Surveys in performing this survey?
- 20 A. Consult in what record?
- 21 Q. Speak to, talk to, communicate in
- 22 | writing.
- 23 A. No. The survey was designed by myself with
- 24 · others at Audits & Surveys.
- 25 Q. But you didn't discuss the survey with

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 | anyone at Audits & Surveys in the context of how
- 2 it was performed or whether the results were valid
- 3 for not valid, whether the organization of the
- 4 question was good or bad. You didn't speak to
- 5 anybody in that regard. Is that correct?
- 6 A. Only I spoke with the attorneys in terms of
- 7 the population or universe we were going to study
- 8 but not in terms of how the sample would be drawn
- 9 or executed or how the questions would be
- 10 | formulated or sequenced.
- 11 Q. Did you show the questionnaires to the
- 12 lawyers before you conducted your pilot survey?
- 13 A. ' I believe so.
- 14 Q. Why do you do that?
- 15 A. I think it's normal procedure to show a
- 16 : client what you are doing.
- 17 Q. Did you do this in person or did you
- 18 send it by mail? I haven't received any
- 19 correspondence to or from you or these lawyers.
- 20 A. I don't recall whether -- I believe it was
- 21 done by phone but I'm really not 100 percent
- 22 positive.
- 23 Q. Were there any comments from the
- 24 . lawyers?
- 25 A. There probably were but no changes in the

	D. Neadle - direct
1	questionnaire came as a result of any comments
2	they made.
3	Q. With whom did you discuss the
4	questionnaire?
5	A. I believe it was Tom Silfen and I may have
6	also discussed it with Barbara Kacir. I don't
7	remember for sure.
•	Q. From Jones, Day? You don't know?
•	A. I think that's who she is with but I
10	wouldn't swear to it.
11	Q. Who else at Audits & Surveys did you
12	work with in designing this survey?
13	A. I worked with Wendy Ereisberg who was the
14	project director on the study for me and I worked
15	with I believe it was Lester Frankel and Paul
16	Flyer on the sample design.
17	HR. EDELL: Let's take a break and let
1.0	you finish your cigarette.
19	(Short break.)
20	(Neadle Exhibite 1 to 8 marked for
21	identification.)
2 2	Q. Mr. Meadle, I show you what has been
23	marked Neadle Exhibit & for identification. Tell
24	us what that is, sir.
2 5	A. It's a copy of notes I made at a meeting on

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

1 July 25, 1985.

2 Q. The first three pages are notes of

3 that meeting, sir?

4 A. Yes.

5

Q. The fourth page is what?

6 A. Notes from a conversation on August 2, '85.

7 The next page is a memorandum to me from Paul

8 | Flyer in August of 1985 and the next page are

9 notes I made in a conversation with Wendy

10 Kreieberg on August 27, '85.

11 Q. Let's go through your notes, please.

12 It says, "64 surgeon general report." Is this

13 just to give you a chronology of events?

14 A. These were things that the attorneys said in

is the meeting.

16 Q. Why did you write them down?

17 A. I guess I was taking notes of what the

18 conversations were. I don't know that I had a

19 specific objective in mind in writing them down.

20 Q. After you have these four different

21 events, the surgeon general's report, the package

22 warning, the change in package warning and the

23 warning on advertising, there's a line and then

24 you have a capital A.

A. Yes.

D.	Nea	dle	-	41	rec	t
----	-----	-----	---	----	-----	---

- .Q. Can you read that, please?
- 2 A. "What comes to mind regarding digarette
- 3 advertising, place of warning in response." I'm
- 4 reading these as full notes, full words, even
- 5 though many of the words here are brief, in my own
- 6 shorthand.

- 7 Q. What does that mean, sir? Not your
- 8 statement but what does this writing mean?
- 9 A. That's an issue that was discussed as a
- 10 possible thing that the study might deal with,
- 11 that a study might deal with, what would come to
- 12 | mind is cigarette advertising, and would anything
- 13 about warnings be in response to that.
- 14 Q. What do you mean by would anything be
- is in response to the digarette advertising?
- 16 A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?
- 17 Q. I don't understand what you mean by
- 18 saying --
- 19 MR. EDELL: Read back his statement
- 20 and that way I can use his precise language.
- 21 (Answer read.)
- 22 A. What comes to mind regarding digarette
- 23 advertising -- that's a potential issue to
- 24 investigate -- among the public and would warnings
- 25 come up, digarette warnings come up in response to

- 1 that.
- 2 Q. Arnold & Porter decided not to look
- 3 into that issue?
- 4 MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of
- 5 the question.
- 6 Q. Did they or didn't they, sir? Did
- 7 they ask you to look into that issue as to what
- 8 would come to --
- 9 A. They didn't ask me to look into that issue.
- 10 It was a possible issue to discuss to look into.
- 11 It wasn't a request, look into the issue of
- 12 cigarette advertising and the place of the warning
- 13 in response to that. It was one of the potential
- 14 | areas of investigation.
- 15 Q. That potential area of investigation
- 16 was not looked into. Correct?
- ·17 A. Not in that form.
- 18 Q. Did you look into the issue of what
- 19 comes into the minds of the American public
- 20 regarding sigarette advertising?
- 21 A. Wo, I did not.
- 22 Q. Why

- 23 A. It wasn't one of the issues that were
- 24 finally decided to be examined.
 - Q. Who decided as to what issues were

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

D. Neadle - dire	et	Tec:	- dire	•	1	d			X		D
------------------	----	------	--------	---	---	---	--	--	---	--	---

- I finally to be examined in this study?
- 2 A. There was a lot of discussion. I believe
- 3 the generalized issues that were to be studied
- 4 were probably a result of the attorneys.
 - Q. Arnold & Porter?
- 6 A. I believe there was more than Arnold &
- 7 Porter represented at this meeting.
 - Q. Shook, Hardy & Bacon?
- 9 A. I don't recall but I believe there were
- 10 three law firms present or representatives of
- 11 three law firms present.
- 12 Q. Do you remember the names of the
- 13 representatives present?
- 14 A. I believe Alan Purvie and Barbara Kacir and
- 15 Tom Silfen.

- 16 Q. Was anyone else present from Audits &
- 17 Surveys other than yourself at this meeting?
- 18 A. I don't recall.
- 19 Q. Do you have a practice to dictate
- 20 memos regarding meetings with clients when you
- 21 beet with the cliente?
- 22 A. No, I don't have such a practice.
- 23 Q. Even when you are working on a survey
- 24 with other people so that they know what's going
- 25 on at different meetings if they are not in

```
48
    D. Neadle - direct
    attendance at those meetings?
1
 2
          Not usually. I would usually verbally brief
    them.
                Read underneath that, the next
    sentence.
               What does it say?
           "Knowledge of sigarette warning, what does
    it mean."
 7
 8
                Did you look into that issue, sir, as
    to knowledge of the cigarette warning and what
10
    does it mean?
          Not specifically the warnings, no.
11
                That was another issue that you didn't
12
    finally decide to look into?
13
14
          That's correct.
                The decision not to look into that
15
16
    issue was decided by the lawyers. Is that
17
    correct?
          In that form it was decided not to look into
18
19
         There were a number of options of
    investigating awareness of emoking dangers and
    they overlapped to some extent.
21
22
                I understand that. What I'm asking
```

you specifically is with regard to the issue of

knowledge regarding cigaratte warnings and what

they mean --

```
49
      Neadle - direct
          We did not look into that issue.
1
                That was a decision made by the
2
              Correct?
3
          I would guess so.
                What does it say underneath that?
5
          "Percent of smokers will get lung cancer."
                You looked into that issue.
7
          Yes.
 8
                             Mr. Bleakley, if you want
                MR. EDELL:
    to take a break for you and Mr. Silfen to talk --
10
                               When I have a message
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
11
    to communicate to Mr. Silfen during the
12
                              If you have a problem
    deposition, I'll do so.
13
    with it, then you can call the magistrate and tell
14
    him.
15
                             I'll take a break until
                MR. EDELL:
16
    you are finished.
17
                MR. SILPEN:
18
                 MR. EDELL:
                             Thank you.
19
                 (Short break.)
20
                 MR. SILFEN: Go ahead.
21
                 (Discussion off the record.)
22
                                I have nothing to say
                 MR. BLEAKLEY:
23
    on the record.
24
                               Go ahead with your
                 MR. SILFEN:
25
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

D. Neadle - direct questioning.

2 NR. EDELL: Off the record there was a conversation between Mr. Bleakiey and myself 4 concerning what questions I might be permitted to ask this witness. I didn't get very far when I 6 asked Mr. Bleakley to put his statement on the 7 record. I'm looking to Mr. Silfen. I don't know which one of the people from Arnold & Porter I 9 should really look to for some direction in that 10 regard.

MR. SILPEN: What the record doesn't show is that your manner when Peter Bleakley attempted to talk to me to get this thing done was hostile and ridiculously combative. Any attempt to handle this thing pleasantly, which I tried to do by having someone call promptly, is discouraged by your way of handling this, so what we will do is very simply when we take a break, I will communicate with the lawyers and I will communicate to you on the record. Now go shead and ask questions.

MR. EDELL: I would greatly appreciate

that.

1

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BLEAKLEY: Cut it out. Act like a grown-up and ask questions.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
51
1
                MR. SILFEN:
 2
    questions.
                MR. EDELL:
                             I resent your
    mischaracterization of my statement when you and
    Mr. Bleakley are -- walking around making
 5
    conversation and distracting me from trying to ask
 8
    questions.
7
8
                MR. BLEAKLEY:
                                Go on with the
 9
    deposition.
                 Get it going.
10
                MR. SILPEM:
                              Go on with your
11
    questioning.
                MR. EDELL: Could you read back the
12
13
    last question, please.
                (Question read.)
14
                Who decided that that was one of the
15
16
    issues that you were going to look into, sir?
17
          I can't recall specifically.
                Was it the lawyers, be it Arnold &
18
    Porter or someone from Shook, Hardy & Bacon or
19
20
    someone from Jones, Day?
          I can't recall epecifically that.
21
                Who gave you directions as to which
22
    issues to look into in this survey?
23
        There was a general discussion of many
24
```

issues or potential issues. I.can't recall who

```
D. Neadle - direct
   specifically said what or the total process by
   which the issues that we wound up with were
   decided upon.
3
                I'm not asking for the name of the
    lawyer, sir, who said that it would be okey to
 5
   look into a particular issue but whether or not it
    was the lawyers who said it's okay to look into
7
    this issue.
                              Object to the form of the
                MR. SILFEN:
    question:
10
                MR. TUCKER:
                              Object to the form of the
11
12
    guestion.
          I just said I can't recall the exact
13
              There was a lot of discussion and I
14
    can't recall the exact process by which the end
15
    results of specifically which issues should be
16
    investigated and which should not and which
17
```

- Q. Were there any issues that you thought should be looked into that weren't?
- 21 A. I don't think so.

19

20

22

23

overlap with others came about.

- Q. Did you make any recommendations to look into certain issues to the lawyers?
- 24 A. I don't believe I recommended any specific 25 issues.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

•	D. Neadle - direct
1	Q. Could you read the next sentence, sir?
2	A. Analysis by degree of smoking,
3	non-smoker-heavy smoker.
4	Q. Was that done in the study?
5	A. In a form, yes.
6	Q. What do you mean by that form?
7	A. There is an analysis of never smokers,
	former smokers and current smokers.
•	Q. How did you define former emokers?
10	A. I would have to see a copy of the
11	questionnaire to recall the exact definition.
12	Q. Was there any attempt to break it down
19	between light emokers and heavy emokers, moderate
14	smokers?
15	A. I don't believe so.
16	Q. Why was that?
17	A. I felt that the more pertinent break or the

Q. What did you base that on?

22 A. Judgment.

Q. What judgment?

24 A. Mine.

18 19

20

21

23

25

Q. What studies have you ever done in

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

	54
	D. Neadle - direct
1	this area upon which you made that judgment?
2	MR. TUCKER: Object to the form of the
3	question.
4	A. I've done a lot of studies regarding
5	people's awareness of various things, and degree
6	of awareness tends to be less sensitive than
7	awareness or a particular behavior pattern versus
8	a non-participant in that particular behavior.
9	MR. EDELL: Could you read that back,
10	please.
11	(Answer read.)
12	Q. It doesn't make a difference to what
13	extent they participate in that behavior. Is that
14	correct?
15	A. No. It could make a difference. My feeling
1 6	is in most studies the biggest difference is
17	between the participants and non-participants,
1,8	although there could be differences by degree of
19	participation.
20	Q. Can you read the next sentence? Again
21	we are talking about Neadle Exhibit 8, right?
22	A. That's correct. "Show ade with warning
2,3	what does it communicate, warning versus pleasure,
24	healthy, happy people."

You didn't look into that issue,

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
55
    D. Neadle - direct
    you, sir?
 2
          That's less of an issue than a possible
               We didn't use that approach.
                Did you show any of the people who
 5
    were interviewed ade?
         'No, we did not.
 7
                Did you show them warnings?
          No, we did not.
 8
                Did you ask them what any cigarette
10
    advertisements meant to them?
11
          No, we did not.
                Is it possible to conduct a survey to
12
    ascertain what cigarette advertisements mean to
13
14
    people?
15
                MR. TUCKER:
                              Object to the form of the
    question.
16
          I believe it is possible to conduct such a
17
    etudy.
18
19
                Now do you do that?
20
          I don't know that I could design it right
21
           I need time to design it.
                In any event, you didn't look into the
22
23
    issue of what cigarette advertising with warnings
    communicated to people because you never showed it
```

to the people. Right?.

	56
	D. Weedle - direct
1	A. Not because we never showed it to the
2	people. I didn't look into that issue.
3	Q. Who decided not to look into that
4	iesue?
5	A. I believe I've already said I can't really
6	recall the total discussion and process by which
7	the conclusions as to which issues would be
•	included in the study was reached.
9	Q. Did you decide to exclude that?
10	MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
1 1	the question.
1 2	A. Showing ade with warning was an
3	impossibility for a telephone study. Therefore,
1 4	the methodology by itself would exclude that
1.5	procedure.
6	Q. But you could have performed a survey
17	which would have permitted you to show ads to
l B	consumers and conduct an interview process,
19	couldn't you?
20	A. Yes, we could have.
21	Q. You conduct those sorts of surveys all
2 2	the time, don't you, sir?
23	MR. SILFEN: Object to the form of the

Non-telephone surveys.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. Sometimes you perform surveys for
- 3 clients which include both telephone surveys and
- 4 : face-to-face interviews. Correct?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 ! Q. There's nothing that would have
- 7 precluded you from doing that in this case?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 | Q. Turn to the second page, please, where
- 10 it says capital B period. Would you read that,
- 11 please?
- 12 A. Capital B?
- 13 Q. Isn't there a capital B?
- 14 A. I'm sorry. This is stapled incorrectly. I
- 18 was on page three. Yes. B.
- 16 Q. Would you read that, please.
- 17 | A. "What have you heard re smoking, what have
- 18 ! you heard re smoking and health. What have you
- 19 heard re smoking and cancer, et cetera."
- Q. Did you look into those issues, sir?
- 21 A. Not in this form but yes.
- 22 Q. What do you seen by not in this form?
- 23 A. Well, I would have to have a copy of the
- 24 questionnaire to show what the form, specific form
- 25 Was

	D. Neadle - direct
1	Q. You don't recall without looking at
2	the questionnaire?
3	A. Well, we maked, I believe we looked into the
4	issue of smoking and health relationships.
5	Q. Can you read what appears next to page
6	two of Neadle Exhibit 8.
7	A. "Measure, awareness not belief, high
	awareness regardless of source.
9	Q. What do you mean by "high awareness
10	regardless of source*?
11	A. Would there be high awareness without regard
12	to the specific source of that awareness.
13	Q. Why was the source of the information
14	not important, sir?
15	A. People can become aware of things from a
16	whole host of sources. I don't believe we could
17	list them all but the general concept that we were
1 4	getting towards was to what degree is the public
19	aware of cigarettes' health relationships and not
20	where it came from.
21	Q. What was your understanding as to why
2 2	it was not important to look into the beliefs

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

25

```
D. Neadle - direct
   little caution, Mr. Edell. I'm going to start
1
   objecting to the extent that you are asking him
   the whys that may have been related to him by
   attorneys so if you want to avoid that objection,
   couch your questions accordingly.
                Do you want to answer the question,
          Q.
   e1r?
                MR. SILPEN: Read back the question.
                (Question read.)
                MR. SILPEN: Lot me caution you, Mr.
10
    Neadle, that we have a work product privilege and
   we are going to object to the extent that Marc is
12
    asking you for something the attorneys may have
13
    told you about their thought processes and their
    reasoning. So far Marc has been asking you did
15
    the attorneys decide this, did the attorneys
    decide that: That's okay. If you are going to
17
    answer for yourself for your own understanding,
18
    that's fine. I caution you not to repeat what may
19
    have been told to you of the attorneys' reasoning
20
    for their actions in this case.
21
          That was a note of mine that the attorneys
22
    felt that the issue they wanted measured was -
```

They didn't want you to look into the

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

Q.

25 :

```
D. Neadle - direct
   issue of beliefs concerning cigarette smoking and
    health? Is that correct?
3
                MR. BLEAKLEY: Object to the form of
    the question.
          They said they want to look into the
    awareness. I'm not sure if anyone said don't look
                  That was my-note of the distinction.
                You were led to believe that they were
          Q.
  , not concerned with looking into the issue of --
                MR. SILFEN: Object to the form of the
10
   question.
                MR. EDELL: Can I finish, Mr. Silfen?
12
                MR. SILFEN: Sure you can. I thought
13
   you were done but I'm going to object anyway.
                MR. EDELL: Would you read that back,
15
   please.
                (Question read.)
17
                MR. SILFEM: Objection to the form of
18
    the question.
                            I haven't finished.
                MR. EDELL:
20
21
                MR. SILFEN:
                            Finish.
                Mr. Neadle, you were led to believe
22
    that the attorneys were not interested in looking
    into the issue of what beliefs people had
    concerning eigerette smoking and health. Is that
```

```
D. Neadle - direct
   correct?
1
                             Objection to the form of
2
                MR. SILPEN:
                   Ward, I think we are at that line
 3
    the question.
    that I was talking about and I'll tell you again,
    if you want answers to questions, don't ask him
    the whys of what the attorneys did or said.
    haven't done that in any of the depositions. We
    are not going to do it now so why don't you try
    another question.
                MR. EDELL:
                            I don't understand what
10
    your comments mean, Mr. Silfen.
11
12
                MR. SILPEN:
                             My comment is, at this
    point I'm saying that you are inquiring into work
    product and you should ask another question.
    try to be liberal about this.
15
                                    I tried to be
    liberal eo far.
16
                MR. EDELL:
17
                             Does that mean you are
18
    directing the witness not to answer the question?
                MR. SILPEN:
                              Yes.
                                    Maybe you can
19
    reformulate the question so it will work better
20
    but that particular form of the question I'm
21
    objecting to.
                What led you to write down "not
23
          Q.
    belief"?
```

I believe it was my distinction from

```
62
    D. Neadle - direct
1
    awareness.
2
                Is there a difference between
      areness and belief?
          Yes.
                Did you inquire in this survey as to
          Q.
    people's beliefs concerning cigarette smoking and
   health?
7
          Yes.
                Which questions inquired into people's
          Q.
    beliefs concerning cigarette smoking and health?
          I would have to look at a questionnaire but
11
    I believe it was question three.
                How do you define belief, sir, in the
13
    context of your being an expert in opinion survey
    research?
15
          What people think is the truth.
16
                What was it about question number
17
    three that reflected people's beliefs concerning
18
    cigarette emoking and health?
19
          I would have to look at a copy of the
20
21
    question so I don't misquote anything.
                Let's take a look at Meadle Exhibit
22
        It looks like the questionnaire from your
                    Is that correct, sir?
    pilot project.
```

That is a questionnaire from the pilot

	D. Neadle - direct
1	project.
2	Q. Is number three the question in the
3	pilot project which you believe would reflect an
4	individual's beliefs concerning cigarette emoking
5	and health?
6	A. Yes, with specific reference to lung cancer.
7	Q. What about that quistion, sir, would
8	reflect an individual's beliefs concerning
9	cigarette emoking and lung cancer?
10	A. People are being asked what they think, how
11	many smokers do they think will get lung cancer
1 2	because they smoke.
13	Q. Is there any indication that if they
14	didn't know how many people out of 100 would die
15	from lung cancer that they were to guese?
16	MR. SILFEN: Let me hear the question
17	back.
18	(Question read.)
19	MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
20	the question.
21	A. The question doesn't ask about dying.
22	Q. Is there any indication in question
23	three that if they, they being the people who were
24	being interviewed, didn't know how many people out
	1

```
D. Neadle - direct
   to guess as to what that number was going to be?
   Is that correct?
                MR. SILPEN:
    question.
                (Question read.)
                MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of
    the question.
          Yes.
                If a person answered in the narrative
    portion of the questionnaire -- I believe that
   would be question number one, sir. Do you see
    that -- that they didn't think that cigarette
   emoking caused lung cancer, would you expect for
    them to answer number three by indicating a
    certain number of people who would die or who
    would contract lung cancer?
                MR. SILFEN: Wold it. Objection to
17
    the form of the question.
18
                THE WITHESS: Could you read that
19
    back.
20
                (Question read.)
21
                MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of
22
    the question.
          They might.
                What would that mean from a research
25
```

	D. Neadle - direct
1	survey perspective, that in the narrative portion
2	of question number one they said I don't think
3	cigarette sacking causes lung cancer but yet in
4	number three, the person indicates that twenty out
\$	of a hundred people were going to contract lung
6	cancer from their smoking?
7	MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of
8	the question.
9	A. I would have to look at the answer
10	specifically for respondents like that to look at
11	their pattern. I can't tell you specifically what
12	one respondent might say, might mean.
13	Q. What would you look for?
14	A. I would look at their answers to all the
15	questions.
16	Q. What other answers would you look at
17	that would help you resolve the question as to why
18	somebody would answer those two questions
19	apparently in a different way?
20	MR. TUCKER: Object to the form of the
21	question.
2 2	MR. SILFEM: Objection to the form of
23	the question. You can answer.
24	A. I would have to see what the rest of what

- have to see what their answers were to the other 1
- questions. People are not always 100 percent 2
- logical. I would have to try to look at it to see
- what they might mean.
- .Could it be the sequence of the
- questions that could account for a person in the
- narrative portion, that being question number one,
- indicating that he or she didn't believe that
- cigarette emoking caused lung cancer and then in
- number three indicate that some number of people
- were going to develop lung cancer from their
- 12 cigarette emoking?
- 13 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 16 the question.
- I'm not sure I even understand that 15
- 16 question.
- 17 I thought you indicated before that
- 18 the sequence of questions might affect the
- responses from the people being interviewed.
- 20 incorrect?
- 21 I said the sequence of questions could
- 22 affect results, yes.
- 23 What I'm asking you is could the
- sequence of questions in this questionnaire result
- in someone who doesn't believe, at least in

	D. Neadle - direct
1	question number one, that cigarette sacking causes
2	lung cancer, indicate that some number of people
3	in answer to number three were going to contract
4	lung cancer from their cigarette emoking.
5	MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
6	the question.
7	A. It's hypothetical. I said I'd have to look
8	at the questionnaires.
•	Q. You didn't see any such responses in
10	the questionnaires that you reviewed. Is that
11	right, eir?
12	A. I don't recall. This was two years ago. I
13	don't recall.
14	Q. What would you do if you saw such a
15	response?
16	MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
17	the question? I'm going to caution the witness
18	not to speculate or guees. If Mr. Edell wants you
19	to guess, he'll tell you.
20	A. I don't know.
21	Q. You don't know what you would do as an
2 2	expert in survey research if you saw an answer to
	your questionnairs where the person being
24	interviewed said I don't believe cigarette smoking

```
: D. Neadle - direct
    one but yet indicated in question number three
    that they thought that some number of people might
    contract lung cancer from their cigarette smoking?
                MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
    the question. He already answered it twice.
          As I said, it's hypothetical. I'd have to
    look at the whole thing.
                I'm asking you a hypothetical
    question.
10
                MR. SILFEN:
                             He answered it twice.
    Now he answered it three times.
12
                MR. EDELL:
                            Mr. Silfen. I don't think
13
    you want him to answer the question.
14
                MR. SILFEN:
                             I don't want him to give
    l different answer thân he has given just because
16
    you've asked it three times.
                                  Now he is done.
17
    Move on.
18
          Q.
                What other questions would you look
    at, #177
19
20
                MR. TUCKER: Object to the form of the
21
    question.
               He answered it.
22
                MR. SILFEN: Object. You can give him
    the same answer again and let's move on.
          I would look at the rest of the respondent's
24
    comments in question one and I would look at
```

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

1 question two.

2 MR. SILPEN: Now we are done and if

3 you ask him again, I'll direct him not to answer

4 the question.

MR. EDELL: Fine.

6 Q. What in question number two has

7; anything to do with the respondent's beliefs

concerning eigerette smoking and lung cancer?

A. Question two doesn't deal directly with

10 . people's beliefs.

11 Q. Does it deal in any way with people

12 people's beliefs?

13 A. No. It deals with their awareness.

Q. How many people were involved in the

15 survey?

17

16 A. You mean how many respondents?

Q. Yee. How many respondents?

18 A. 3,500.

19 Q. If you had 50 percent of those

20 respondents indicating in response to number one

21 | that they didn't believe cigarette emoking caused

22 lung cancer but yet they responded to question

23 number three by indicating that they thought some

24 number of people out of that 100 would develop

15 lung cancer from their digarette emoking, what

```
70
   D. Neadle - direct
1 would you do?
               MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of
    the question.
         It's hypothetical.
                             I would have to look at
 5 the results.
         Q.
              You'd have to look at each one of the
7 | questionnaires?
         I would have to look at the overall pattern
 9 of results.
              What in the pattern would suggest to
11; you that there was a problem in the sequencing of
   the questions?
               MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of
13
14 the question.
          I don't know. I don't believe there's any
   problem here with the sequencing of the questions.
               MR. EDELL: Could you read the
17
18 guestion back, please.
                (Question read.)
          I don't believe there's a problem in the
20 A.
    sequencing of the questions.
21
          Q.
                I understand that.
22
                MR. SILFEN: That's how he answered it
23
    before.
               MR. EDELL: Can I finish, Mr. Silfen?
25 .
```

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

MR. SILFEN: Sure.

2 MR. EDELL: You keep saying sure but

3 you keep interrupting my questions.

MR. SILPEN: Only when you ask the

5 ; wame question over again, and I'm going to keep

6 objecting.

1

16

7 MR. EDELL: Please save it until I

8 completed my question. I don't know how many

9 itimes I can ask the same courtesy but I'll

10 ; continue to do so.

11 Q. I maked you a hypothetical question.

12 Let's assume that 50 percent of the respondents

13 indicated in answer to number one that they did

14 not believe that cigarette smoking caused lung

15 cancer but yet the same 50 percent indicated in

response to number three that a certain number of

17 the 100 people who emoked would develop lung

18 cancer. What pattern would you expect to see in

19 your examination of the data if there were a

20 problem in the sequencing of the questions?

21 MR. SILVEN: Objection to the form of

22 the question.

23 A. Hypothetically if 50 percent made the

24 : specific statement in question one that they did

25 not think that cigarette smoking was related to or

	7
	D. Neadle - direct
1	caused lung cancer and then specifically gave a
2	number here, I would have some questions about th
3	wording of the questions being properly
4	communicated but that's hypothetical.
5	Q. How do you make sure that the wording
6	of the questions are properly communicated to the
7	respondente?
8	A. We did a pilot test and looked through the
9	responses and they appeared to be logical.
10	Q. Did you look through the responses
11	yourself?
12	A I looked through some of them and other
13	members of my staff looked through all of them.
14	Q. When you emid they looked to be
15	logical, what do you mean?
16	A. That people seemed to be understanding the
17	questions and answering them in the way they were
1,8	meant to be answered. They gave the right kinds
19	of replies.
20	Q. How does one determine whether or not
21	they gave the right kinds of replies?

they were within the framework of the question?

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 A. By reading them.
- Q. What percentage of the questionnaires
- 3 did you read? Again with the pilot study that we
- 4 ; are talking about now.
- 5 MR. TUCKER: You are talking about him
- 6 personally?
- 7 MR. EDELL: Yes.
- 8 MR. TUCKER: Thank you.
- 9 A. I personally probably read twenty or thirty
- 10 percent of them and other members of my staff read
- 11 100 percent of them.
- 12 Q. Who were these other members, sir?
- 13 A. Wendy Kreisberg, who was our project
- 14 · director.
- 15 Q. Anyone else?
- 16 A. Yes. Doris Carella.
- 17 ! O. Who is Doris Carella?
- 18 A. Coding supervisor in our coding department.
- 19 Q. What training has she had in
- 20 determining whether or not the responses are or
- 21 hare not logical?
- 22 A. At least five to ten years of doing coding
- 23 and reading questionnaires.
- 24 Q. Tell us what coding is, sir.
- 25 A. Coding is the process by which text

D.	Nea	dle	-	dir	ect
----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----

- responses to open-ended questions are categorized.
- Q. Is that subjective?
- 3 A. Coding is an informed judgment within, of
- 4 . classifying response into a specific category
- 5 that's been set up or within the specific series
- 6 of categories that have been set up.
- Q. Are there any potential problems in
- & categorizing responses to open-ended questions,
- 9 8177
- 10 A. I'm not sure I understand what you mean by
- 11 | potential problems.
- 12 Q. What I mean by potential problems is a
- 13 problem that might result from the coder
- 14 miscategorizing or improperly judging into which
- 15 category an open-ended response would fall.
- 16 : A. Since it is an informed judgment, I can't
- 7 say that every single coding person or every
- is single one of us would always categorize something
- 19 in the same category. If that is the problem you
- 20 | are talking about, yes, I think overall, since
- 21 samples of each coder's work is checked by someone
- 22 else to check the categorization, that that's
- 23 almost kind of a random kind of occurrence as
- 24 opposed to some systematic type of a problem.
- 25 Q. What guidelines did you provide the

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 coders in this study as to what categories they
- 2 should use for coding these open-ended responses
- 3 to question number one?
- 4 : A. I reviewed lists of sample statements, the
- 5 suggested categories that would be set up to
- 6 . categorize those statements and approved the final
- 7 set of categories before the coding was actually
- 8 done.
- Q. Did you give them any guidelines
- 10 ; initially, though, sir, as to how to categorize
- 11 these responses?
- 12 : A. Only to make sure they separate negative and
- 13 positive kinds of mentions about digarettes or
- 14 smoking.
- 15 Q. How did you determine whether an
- 16 open-ended response was positive or negative?
- 17 A. They read the response.
- 18 Q. If I was to say that digarette emoking
- 19 was addictive, is that a positive or negative
- 20 response?
- 21 · A. That would be negative.
- 22: MR. BLEAKLEY: Mr. Edell, I'm going to
- 23 be leaving shortly and perhaps you should, if you
- 24 don't mind, take a minute and ask the questions
- 25 that you have about this other matter before I

```
D. Neadle - direct
   leave since I'm the one who checked with our
   office on the protective order in that case.
  think the answey is that the questions you have,
   Mr. Neadle will be able to answer without
   violating the terms of that protective order.
 5
          Q.
                Can you tell us the nature of the
   survey that you performed for Arnold & Porter in
    that matter that you thought you could not tell us
   about because of this protective order, sir?
          I did a survey of a TV commercial and got
10
   people's reactions to it.
                What was the subject of the
12
   litigation? What were the issues?
          I believe the issue is that a particular
    Advil commercial is misleading with regard to its
    safety on the stomach or in the stomach.
```

19 mieleading?
20 A. I performed a survey with a different

whether or not the commercial was or was not

Did you perform a survey to ascertain

- Q. I'm sorry, sir?
- 23 A. I performed the survey with a different
- 24 | commercial.

commercial.

17

21

25 G. What commercial did you perform a

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 | survey?
- 2 A. With a Mediprin commercial.
- Q. Did you make any determinations as to
- 4 whether or not that connercial was or was not
- 5 misleading?
- 6 A. I did not make any determination. I just
- 7 : presented the results of the survey.
- Q. What wore the results of the survey?
- 9 A. I can't recall the numbers. Well,
- 10 approximately, it was about 83 or 84 percent of
- 11 all of the respondents in this particular survey
- 12 thought the Mediprin, as a result of seeing the
- 13 commercial, that Mediprin was a safe product for
- 14 them themselves to use.
- 15 : Q. Was that a belief survey, sir?
- 16 A. No. It was a survey on what was
- 17 | communicated by the commercial.
- 18 Q. Could you perform a similar survey
- 19 with regard to cigarette advertising?
- 20 MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
- 21 of the question.
- 22 A. There is no cigarette advertising on TV.
- 23 This was a study of a specific TV connercial.
- 24 O. Could you perform a similar study of
- 25 print advertising for cigarettes?

```
Neadle - direct
1
                MR. SILFEN:
                              Objection.
 2
                                Objection to the form
    of the question.
          Yes, I assume we could.
                How would you go about that, sir?
          I would have to think about that to design
          Q.
                Who did Arnold & Porter represent in
         matter that you performed this survey?
10
          American Home Products.
11
          Q.
                They manufacture what product?
          Advil.
12
13
          Q.
                Why was it that you performed this
    survey with regard to Mediprin as opposed to
15
    Advil7
16
                MR. SILPEN:
                              Objection.
                MR. BLEAKLEY: I think he can answer
17
    that question. Did you hear the question, Mr.
18
19
    Needle?
20
                THE WITNESS:
21
          To be used as a control for a survey done by
    someone for Johnson & Johnson.
                Do you know what position American
23
    Home Products was taking in that litigation
```

vis-a-vis the issue of whether or not the

	79
	D. Neadle - direct
1	advertising for Advil was or was not misleading?
2	A. That the commercial is not misleading.
3	Q. What, if any, relevance did your
4	survey have to that issue?
5	MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
6	of the question.
7	A. It had relevance to the survey that was, to
	a survey that was being submitted by Johnson &
9	Johnson.
10	'Q. What relevance?
LI	MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
1 2	of the question.
i 3	A. It was conducted using an identical set of
14	questions and techniques as was used in a survey
18	by someone for Johnson & Johnson.
16	Q. Was it the purpose of the survey to
17	show that you would get the same results with
18	Mediprin as you would for Advil?
19	MR. BLEAKLEY: Objection to the form
20	of the question.
21	A. The same or similar results.
22	Q. That was used by Arnold & Porter to

- of the question.

 A. I'm afraid I can't answer that.

 MR. EDELL: I'm finished with that

 line of questioning.

 Q. What do you do with the answers to

 these questions when you get them, sir?

 MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of

 the question. You may answer.

 Q. Let's look at the questionneire

 teelf. Take a look at question number one. What

 do you do when you get a narrative response to,

 for example, number one on Neadle Exhibit 8 for

 identification?
- 14 A. We have our coding department make lists of 15 the specific verbatim responses and then set up 16 what they feel would be broad outlines. Kinds of 17 categories they would set up based on those 18 answers.
- Q. After they set up these broad
 categories, what do they do next?

 MR. SILFEN: Your previous line was
 with respect to the pilot. Is this the pilot or
 the regular?
- 24 MR. EDELL: We are talking about
- 25 Neadle Exhibit & for identification. It's right

D. Neadle - direct

i	D. Neadle - direct
1	in front of him.
2	THE WITHESS: That's the pilot study.
3	MR. SILFEN: The pilot study, fine,
4	THE WITNESS: Could you read the last
5	question.
6	(Question read.)
7	MR. SILFEN: Do you mean for him to
8	distinguish what he did with the pilot and what he
•	did with the main study or what?
10	HR. EDELL: If you don't understand
11	the question, object to the form of it and the
12	witness can answer if he understands, Mr. Silfen.
13	MR. SILFEN: Object to the form.
14	A. With respect to the pilot study
15	questionnaire in Exhibit \$, we then, they reviewed
16	them with, the coding supervisor reviewed these
17	with the project director and myself. We set up
10	some more detailed categories into which the
19	coding supervisor then classified the responses.
20	Q. When you say the coding supervisor
21	classified the responses, is this for the purpose
22	of input into a computer?
23	A. Yes, it is, but not in the pilot study.
24	Q. I'm going to show you some other

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 related to the project study. Just tell us what
- 2 they were. Needle Exhibit 2 for identification,
- 3 can you tell us what that is?
- 4 A. These are interviewer specifications for the
- 5 pilot study.
- 6 Q. Did the specifications change for the
- 7 final study?
- 8 A. Yes, they did.
- Q. In what way did they change?
- 10 A. I don't know that I can tell you all the
- 11 changes without comparing them but certainly the
- 12 assignment changed.
- 13 | Q. Can you tell us what Needle Exhibit 4
- 14 18, 8127
- 15 A. Readle Exhibit 4 is a worksheet used by our
- 16 coding department with respect to the pilot study.
- 17 Q. The response categories, those are
- 18 categories that are created by the coder. Is that
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. Yes, these are.
- 21 Q. I show you what has been marked Neadle
- 22 Exhibit S. Can you tell us what that is.
- 23 A. That is another worksheet used by our coding
- 24 department with respect to the pilot survey.
- 25 Q. Who prepared that, sir?

	D. Neadle - direct
_	
1	A. I believe Doris Carella.
2	Q. Did you make any changes to this?
3	A. I don't recall whether I made changes to
4	this or an earlier version or exactly what. It's
5	two years ago.
6	Q. Tell us what Needle Exhibit 6 is,
_	•
	, Gir.
8	MR. BLEAKLEY: Could I just talk to
9	Mr. Silfen for just one second?
10	MR. EDELL: You certainly may.
11	(Short pause.)
12	A. It is another worksheet used by our coding
13	i department. I can't identify it as to whether it.
	was for the pilot study or the main full study
15	that was reported.
16	Q. Did you review that, sir?
17	A. Did I review this particular document?
1 8	Q. In the context of your putting
19	together the final study that you had conducted
20	for Arnold & Porter in this litigation.
21	A. I'm not sure whether this is from the final
2 2	study or for the pilot so I can't tell you whether
	I reviewed it in order to put together the full
	is antenna of the negation of bar salarmer sugar

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

- : D. Neadle direct
- 1 what that is?
- 2 A. It's a variety of different documents.
- 3 Q. That's how I got them, stapled
- 4 together like that, so maybe you can help clarify
- 5 ; 1t.
- 6 A. The first page are the results to question
- 7 one for the first phase of the pilot study and for
- 8 the second phase of the pilot study in total and
- 9 by whether or not the respondent was a current,
- 10 | former or never smoker. The second page are the
- 11 results to question three for the second wave of
- 12 the pilot study in total. No, I'm sorry. It is
- 13 the results to the question on how many digarette
- 14 smokers will get lung cancer because they emoke
- is for the second wave of the pilot study. I can't
- 16 ; identify the question number because I don't have
- 17 the questionnaire for the second phase of the
- 18 pilot study here.
- 19 Q. When you say the second phase of the
- · 20 | pilot study, there were two phases to the pilot
 - 21 study?
 - 22 A. Yes, there were.
 - 23 Q. Why was it done in two phases?
 - 24 A. After the first phase, I felt we should add
 - 25 . a question on whether or not people were emokers

	D. Neadle - direct
_	
1	for analytic purposes so we did a second wave of
2	the pilot study to test that question.
3	Q. Getting back to Meadle Exhibit 8, I
4	believe, your notes, turn to page three, please.
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Could you read that to us.
. 7	A. High percentage of people have high concern
	re cigarette health concerns. It said re
9	cigarette and cigarette advertising. The
10	cigarette advertising was crossed out in my notes.
11	Q. Where did you get that information?
12	MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of
13	the question.
14	A. I don't believe it was information as much
15	as it was an issue.
16	Q. It was an issue that you were going to
17	look into?
18	A. Y
19	Q. Did you look into that issue in this
20	c440?
21	MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
22	the question.
23	A. I looked into the issues of awareness and

```
D. Neadle - direct

way these notes are.

Q. Which question in your study p
```

- Q. Which question in your study performed for Arnold & Porter reflects the issue of whether people have a high concern regarding cigarettes and health concerns?
- 6 A. The issue of concern is not but the issue of 7 awareness and belief is.
- 8 Q. What's the difference between 9 awareness, belief and concern?
- 10 A. Awareness is, I don't know how to describe
 11 it, what people are aware of, what has come across
 12 their mind and they have remembered. Belief is
 13 what they think is the truth. A concern to me
 14 would be a measure of, kind of the degree of worry
 15 or degree to which they think that's a problem per
 16 se.
 - Q. Let's take a look at number two on page three. Could you read that for us.

 A. "What does cigarette warning mean. What'
 - the contribution of warning to serious health concern, especially re lung cancer. Is it life threatening or shortening."
- Q. Did you look into that issue of what does the digarette warning contribute to serious health concerns, especially lung cancer?

19

21

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 A. No. As I eaid, we didn't get into, the
 2 study doesn't get into the degree of concern
 3 people have and it doesn't get into the cigarette
- Q. I assume that you don't know how it came about that you decided not to look into that
- 8 A. That's correct.

Is that correct?

warning per ee.

- 9 Q. You don't know whether it was the
 10 Arnold & Forter lawyers or the Shook, Hardy &
 11 Bacon lawyers or the Jones, Day lawyers who told
 12 You not to look into that?
- 13 MR. TUCKER: Object to the form of the 14 question.
- 15 A. I don't recall the specific. As I said
 16 before, we are talking about a conversation of
 17 over two years ago and there was a lot of
 18 discussion of a lot of potential questions and
 19 issues and I don't recall the exact process by
 20 which we got to the issues that were finally
 21 agreed to as the ones to be included in the
- Q. Tell us about your general recollection of this process.
 - A. The lawyers discussed a lot of different

22

survey.

D. Neadle - direct

1 potential issues, questions, mostly issues, I

2 guess, or I'm using question in a broad sense, not

3 to mean a specific question wording, that are

4 possible topics for a survey to provide some data

5 on and I can't really go through their thought

6 process but at the end we wound up with the issues

7 or objectives, issues that were included in the

Q. Normally when you have a client that comes in to ask you to do some kind of research survey for them and they say look, I want you to look into these issues, do you decide what issues they ultimately should or should not inquire into?

MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of the question.

A. No, I don't usually decide what issues they should look into or should not although sometimes I will advise them on issues that I think are outside the scope of the kind of study that's envisioned or that would be difficult to obtain valid information on.

Q. Isn't the usual practice that your clients ultimately decide what issues they want you to look into, sir?

MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of

study.

11

12

14

15

16

18

20

21 22

- 1 the question. You can enswer.
- 2 A. The client usually decides the issues, yes.
- 3 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that
- 4 ; that was not the case here?
- 6 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 5 the question. Go ahead.
- 7 A. No, I don't have any reason to believe that
- 8 | that wasn't the case here.
- 9 Q. Your understanding as to who the
- 10 client is in this litigation is that it's Arnold &
- 11 Porter, Shock, Hardy & Bacon and Jones, Day. Is
- 12 that correct?
- 13 A. That's correct.
- 14 ! Q. Let's take a look at number three on
- 15 page three of Meadle Exhibit 8.
- 16 A. "Public overperceives danger, (probability
- 17 of getting illness)."
- 18 Q. Did you look into that issue?
- 19 A. I looked into the issue of what the public
- 20 perceives as the probability of getting lung
- 21 cancer as a result of cigarette emoking.
- 22 Q. Included in that perception was the
- 23 ! recipient's guessing as to what the probability
- 24 was that people would contract lung cancer. Is
- 25 that correct?

- 1 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 2 the question.
- 3 A. Yes. If a respondent could not answer it
- 4 : offhand, they were probed as to their best
- 5 estimate or best guess.
- 6 Q. Would you read number four to us,
- 7 please.
- B A. "Everyone knows cigarettes are bad for
- 9 health."
- 10 Q. That was one of the issues that was
- 11 discussed with the lawyers?
- 12 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 13 the question.
- 14 A. Well, the issue discussed, I would say from
- 15 . this, is does everyone know or how many people
- 16 know.
- 17 Q. You put everyone in quotations. What
- 18 do you mean by that?
- 19 A. Probably because someone used that term.
- 20 Q. What do you mean somebody?
- 21 A. I don't believe everyone ever believes
- 22 anything or knows everything, knows anything, so
- 23 any time I would use "everyone knows something," I
- 24 : would put it in quotes.
- 25. Q. Did you look into that issue?

- 1 A. I looked into the issue of awareness of the
- 2 argument that digarettes are bad for health. I
- 3 didn't look into what they specifically know.
- 4 Q. What's number five, sir?
- 5 A. Five is, "Awareness that 'health concern'
- 6 is part of advertising."
- 7 Q. What does that mean?
- 8 A. That would be a reference to the warning,
- 9 what would be the degree of awareness that there's
- 10 : a warning in all cigarette advertising.
- 11 Q. You didn't look into that issue, did
- 12 you?
- 13 A. No, we did not.
- 14 Q. Underneath those five potential issues
- 15 is a notation, "Call Tom Silfen with
- 16 recommendations, 7-29." Correct?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- 18 Q. What recommendations?
- 19 A. The recommendations of the questionnaire
- 20 design that I would come up with.
- 21 Q. Tell us about that conversation.
- 22 A. I really don't recall the conversation.
- 23 | It's two years ago. I don't recall the specific
- 24 conversation.
- 25 Q. Had you developed a questionnaire by

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

D. Neadle - direct

1 7-29-857

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Turning to the next page, there's an

4 entry for 8-2-85.

S A. Yes.

Q. What is that, sir?

7 A. It says, "Illness linked directly to

. smoking."

9 Q. What does that mean?

10 A. Is illness linked directly to emoking.

11 Q. Was that a telephone conversation or

12 was that just a note to yourself? Now did it come

13 about that you wrote that down on August 2, 1985?

14 A. I don't recall.

15 : Q. Underneath that there are two

16 sentences. Could you read that for us.

17 A. "1. What comes to mind re digarettes.

18 2: What percent of cigarette emokers get illness

19 because they smoke? Lung cancer will get out of

20 100.

21 Q. Is that a result of a phone call with

22 one of the lawyers?

23 A. I believe points one and two are. I believe

24 the "will get out of 100" is a notation I made

25 myself as a way of obtaining information on

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- l percent of smokers.
- Q. With whom did you speak concerning
- 3 these notations?
- 4 A. I can't be sure.
- 5 Q. Turn to the next page. I believe it's
- 6 ; a memorandum from Paul Flyer to you.
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. It makes reference to a rotation?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. Rotation of what, sir?
- 11 A. A rotation of question two in the pilot
- 12 study which was asked of approximately half the
- 13 , respondents in one sequence and half the
- 14 respondents in a different sequence.
- 15; Q. Why did rotating those two have an
- 16 effect?
- 17 A. Because it provides respondents with a
- 18 different sequence of the same questions.
- 19 Q. How do you know what sequence to use,
- 20 then, if you see that you get a different effect?
- 21 A. We don't really know for sure in a scale
- 22 type question like this which sequence to use.
- 23 That's why we used both, each with helf the
- 24 respondents, so we could in effect compute totals
- 25 based on an average of the two and also compare

```
94
  D. Neadle - direct
   whether in fact there are any differences.
 2
                Is that what you did in the final
    study?
          Yes.
                Did you rotate any other questions?
          No, I don't believe so.
7
          Q.
                Why was that?
          Well, this was the only subject matter
    question which constituted a scale of ascendency
    or descendency in questions or in items.
                Whose idea was it to rotate the
11
          Q.
    sequence in question number two?
12
          I would guess it was mine although I can't
13
    positively say that someone else in my office
    didn't suggest that we should do it.
16
                Look at the last page of your notes,
             Can you read them to us?
17
          These are notes of a conversation with Wendy
18
    Kreisberg, the project director on August 27.
    says, "Nave 1, sequence of responses to question
20
21
    one. -
```

Can I ask you what does that meen,

I thought there was only one, question one

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

was the open-ended question.

That's correct.

22

23

25 · A.

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 Q. So what was there about the sequence
 2 to question number one that you were discussing
 3 with Ms. Kreisberg?
- 4 A. The possibility of looking at the results by
- 5 the sequence of responses since many respondents
- 5 gave more than one response to the question.
- 7 Q. Did you do some type of analysis by
- 8 sequence?
- 9 A. No, we did not.
- o Q. Why?
- 11 A. We decided that we weren't going to use that
- 12 in the full-scale surveys so we didn't bother to
- 13 do.
- 14 Q. What's the next entry?
- 15 A. The next entry is N actuals 3,500.
- 16 Q. Is it the number of surveys?
- 17 A. The sample size, yes.
- 18 Q. It says 16 plus years?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. Why did you use 16 years and older for
- 21 the survey?
- 22 A. Because the attorneys said they wanted to
- 23 measure the population 16 years of age and older.
- Q. Underneath there you have 3,500 equals
- 25 55 percent plus what?

- D. Needle direct
- 1 A. On price.
- 2 Q. What does that mean?
- 3 A. I believe that referred to the fact that I
- 4 had originally quoted an estimate to the attorneys
- 5 of what the survey would cost for a different
- 6 sample size and that with this sample size, that
- 7 | it would make about a 55 percent difference in the
- 8 price.
- 9 Q. 55 percent less or greater than?
- 10 A. 3reater since this was a larger sample size
- 11 than the original proposal.
- 12 Q. The original proposal was between 50
- 13 and \$100,000?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form.
- 16 Q. I thought you said that the original
- 17 proposal was between 50 and \$100,000.
- 18 A. I believe what I said was that the cost of
- 19 the survey was between 50 and \$100,000.
- 20 Q. Sorry.
- 21 MR. SILFEN: Since you are finished
- 22 those notes, I will ask the usual quarter to one
- 23 question.
- 24 MR. EDELL: We can break for lunch if
- 25 you would like.

D. Neadle - direct

(Luncheon Recess)

2 AFTERNOOM SESSION

(Exhibit Neadle-9 marked for

4 : identification.)

1

8 Q. Mr. Neadle, I show you what has been

6 marked Neadle Exhibit 9 for identification. It

7 has "Draft Subject to Revision" stamped on top,

8 and also "Confidential (#4918)." The designation

9 of 4918 is the survey that you performed, the

10 final survey that you performed for the lawyers in

11 this case. Correct, sir?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. Is that the entire draft of the report

14 which you prepared for Arnold & Porter, Jones, Day

15 and Shook, Hardy & Bacon?

16 A. (Examining document.) It's a draft of the

17 entire report without including the actual tabular

18 results.

19 Q. The actual tabular results were

20 included with the draft that you sent to whom,

21 | eir7

22 A. I said this is a draft of the report

23 excluding the tabular results.

24 Q. Did you provide the tabular results to

25 anyone prior to the preparation of the final

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
D. Neadle - direct report in this matter?
```

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. To whom did you send them?

4 A. I believe to Arnold & Forter, Jones, Day,

5 Reavis and Shook, Hardy & Bacon.

6 Q. Were there any changes between the

7 draft and your final report?

8 A. I don't recall. I would have to compare the

9 two versions. I don't believe there were

10 substantive changes but I would have to compare

11 the two versions.

12 Q. Here is Weadle 10 for identification.

13 Tell us what that is.

14 (Neadle Exhibit 10 marked for

15 identification.)

16 A. (Examining document.) This appears to be a

17 copy of the final report.

18 Q. That included the tabular results of

19 the study?

20 A. Yes, it did.

21 Q. When was this report prepared, sir,

22 this being Meadle Exhibit 10 for identification?

23 A. I believe it was prepared during early 1986.

24 MR. EDELL: Would you mark this,

25 . please.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

1 (Neadle Exhibit 11 marked for

identification.) 2

Yes.

- 3 We talked about the guestion of how you defined a emoker and a former emoker previously and you said you needed to take a look at the questionnaire. Do you remember that?
- I show you what has been marked Neadle Exhibit 11 for identification. It appears to be a questionnaire for the final survey, project 4918 10 for September of 1985. Tell us whether or not 11 that was in fact one of the questionnaires that 12 was used for that final survey. 13
- (Examining document.) Yes, it is. 14
- 15 Can you tell us now that you looked at it how you defined former smokers? 16
- Respondents defined it themselves. 17
- 18 They classified themselves as a current emoker,
- former smoker or never smoker. 19
- Is there any indication as to what the respondents meant by former smoker, whether they 21 smoked one digarette once in their life or whether they smoked ten digarettes or ten packs or they 23 snoke for fifty years?
- 25 No.

20

22

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 Q. Is there any indication as to how long
- 2 these people were smoking, sir, if they were
- 3 current smokers?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. You didn't think that that was
- 6 important for your survey?
- 7 A. No. Yes, I didn't think it was important.
- 8. Q. It didn't make a difference whether or
- 9 ; not somebody was smoking two packs a day for 15
- 10 | years as opposed to their taking up cigarettes
- 11 yesterday and smoke a pack a day or one digarette
- 12 a day or two cigarettes a day?
- 13 A. When you say it didn't make a difference,
- 14 I'm not sure I know exactly what you mean.
- 15 Q. You didn't think it was an important
- 16 enough difference to take it into consideration in
- 17 your survey. Correct?
- 18 A. Not for the purpose for which I wanted to
- 19 tuse the question.
- 20 Q. What was the purpose for which you
- 21 wanted to use the question regarding smoking
- 22 | behavior?
- 23 A. To determine whether or not there were major
- 24 differences in the responses to questions one
- 25 through three by whether people consider

- D. Neadle direct

 themselves a smoker, a former smoker or a never

 smoker.
- Q. And deciding whether or not there were or were not major differences, you didn't think it was important to take into consideration the number of years they were smoking or the number of cigarettes that they were smoking. Is that correct, sir?
- 9 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of the question. You may answer.
- 11 A. I didn't think it was as important to
 12 measure degree as it was to measure their own
 13 self-classification of themselves.
- Q. So there wasn't a single objective

 standard by which people were to respond as to

 whether they were former smokers or not. Is that

 correct?
- 18 MR. SILPEN: You've asked the
 19 question. He has answered. You can answer it
 20 again.
- A. The standard was their own perception of where they stood on that scale.
- 23 | Q. There's an indication on the bottom
 24 here where it says, "Jim at above number doesn't
 25 recall doing survey. Also it's a business." What

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 does that mean, sir?
- 2 A. This respondent was called back to determine
- 3 his response to question number four because the
- 4 | interviewer had indicated he had originally said
- 5 that he was a cigar emoker.
- 6 Q. What significance is the fact that he
- 7 didn't remember being called in the first
- # instance?
- 9 A. It means that it should have been validated
- 10 versus other interviews done by the same
- 11 interviewer.
- 12 Q. How do you do that?
- 13 A. We validated, we would call back then a
- 14 number of other interviews done by the same
- 15 interviewer to see if the interviewer in fact did
- 16 their interviews. If there's only one problem,
- 17 then we wouldn't. We would accept it because we
- 18 knew in the past that frequently respondents will
- 19 say no to validation questions because they don't
- 20 want to get on a list and they are afraid a second
- 21 | call means getting on a list.
- 22 Q. Were there any instructions given to
- 23 the interviewers as to how they should conduct the
- 24 interview?
- 25 A. Yes.

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 Q. Where are those instructions?
- 2 A. I believe there was a copy in the materials
- 3 I turned over to counsel. I'm trying to recall
- 4 now whether the instructions were in writing or
- 5 , whether they were only verbal. I believe there
- 6 was -- I don't recall now whether they were in
- 7 writing or not: I know there was a verbal.
- s briefing. I don't recall whether there was a set
- 9 of written instructions or not. I would have to
- 10 look through the material.
- 11 Q. Who conducted the verbal briefing?
- 12 A. The interviewing supervisor.
- 13 Q. Who was that?
- 14 A. At the time it was Susan, I don't recall her
- 15 second name.
- 16 : Q. Is she still with Audits & Surveys?
- 17 A. I don't know.
- 18 Q. Are the interviewers full-time
- 19 | employees?
- 20 | A. No. They are part-time employees for the
- 21 most part.
- 22 Q. What criteria do you use in hiring
- 23 those people?
- 24 A. I can't answer that question. The head of
- 25 our interviewing department would have to answer

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 | that question.
- Q. Do you know if there's any educational
- 3 | requirement?
- 4 A. I don't know what criteria he uses to hire
- 5 the people.
- 6 Q. Do you know what the length of
- 7 orientation is for these interviewers?
- 8 A. They have a general orientation of three to
- 9 | five hours. They have an orientation or briefing
- 10 for each study, depending on the complexity of the
- 11 study.
- 12 Q. I'm talking about this specific study.
- 13 sir. How long was the orientation for the
- 14 interviewers in this study?
- 15 A. I believe it was less than one hour for the
- 16 study.
- 17 Q. How many interviewers did you use in
- 18 performing this study?
- 19 A. I don't know.
- 20 Q. You don't know whether it was one or
- 21 | ten or twenty or fifty?
- 22 A. I know it was more than one. I don't know
- 23 how many were used.
- 24 Q. How were they paid?
- 25 A. By the hour.

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 Q. On the third page there appears the
- 2 second question. Are those the questions that
- 3 were rotated?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. For the purposes of inputting it into
- 5 the computer, how does the computer know which
- 7 questionnaire the information is coming from?
- 8 A. Which sequence?
- Q. Yes.
- 10 A. It knows it by this box here.
- 11 Q. 31-2
- 12 A. Yes. Approximately half the questionnaires
- 13 would have been marked 31-2. The other half would
- 14 have been marked 31-1. That indicates in the
- 15 computer which sequence the questions were in.
- 16; Q. The number that is placed under number
- 17 | three, if there's no comment where it says no
- is comment, how is that put into the computer?
- 19 A. It's punched as 999. Is that what you
- 20 | mean?
- 21 Q. Yes. What does it mean?
- 22 A. That's no answer.
- 23 Q. On some of these there's a zero in
- 24 front of the number. For example, on this one
- 25 which we can mark as Neadle Exhibit 12, there's a

	D. Neadle - direct
1	zero in front of the number. Is that for the
2	purposes of the computer?
3	A. Yee. It's a three-digit field.
4	(Neadle Exhibit 12 marked for
5	identification.)
6	Q. On question number one, if somebody
7	responded to the question by simply indicating
8	emoking, then the interviewer was told to keep
•	asking what else comes to your mind. Is that
10	correct?
11	A. I'm sorry.
12	Q. Do you have the first question in
13	front of you?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Let's assume that I'm an interviewer
16	and I have received instructions from Audits &
17	Surveys. Okay?
18	A. Y
19	Q. And I get on the phone with an
20	interviewee and I ask the question, "When I
21	mention cigarettes, what comes to your mind, " and
22	they say emoking. What do I say next?
23	A. Anything else.
24	Q. You get another response and you keep

```
D. Neadle - direct
   else until the person no longer has anything to
          Is that right?
          That's correct.
                So if the etatement regarding
    cigarette smoking and disease came out as the
    tenth item in terms of this inquiry of the
    interviewee, you didn't take that into
7
    consideration.
                    Is that correct?
                             Objection to the form of
                MR. SILFEN:
    the question.
10
          I'm not sure what you mean I didn't take it
11
                         In what way?
    into consideration.
                Is there any significance to the order
13
  in which people relate to you what comes to their
    mind when you ask a question like, "When I mention
    cigarettes, what comes to your mind?"
          I don't know if there's significance in the
17
    sequence in which things come to their mind.
18
                You don't know because it's outside of
19
    your field of expertise?
20
```

23

Q. Are you finished?

IA. Yes.

Q. If you look at the front of the

questionnaire, it says, "I am," and are they

	D. Weadle - direct
1	supposed to fill in their name there?
2	A. Yee.
3	Q. "Of Audite & Surveye," and it goes on,
	"I'm calling long distance and we are doing a
	study about cigarette smoking." Does the fact
•	that you advice the interviewee as to the purpose
7	for your conducting the study bias their responses
•	in any way?
9	A. I don't believe it biases. We are not
10	telling them the purpose of the study but rather
11	the subject matter of the study.
12	Q. That in your opinion doesn't have an
13	effect on the responses that they give. Is that
14	correct, sir?
15	A. Knowing the subject matter, no, I don't
16	think it biases their response.
17	Q. Why is it that some surveys are
18	conducted where the questions are intermingled
19	among other questions?
20	MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
21	the question.
22	MR. EDELL: Maybe it's unarticulate.
23	Q. You haven't seen any surveys on
24	cigarette emoking and health so it's a little

```
D. Neadle - direct
   from me, there are surveys in which they
   intermingle the questions other than those
 2
   specifically dealing with cigarette emoking and
   health. In your opinion, is there a reason why
   someone would do that from the perspective of an
    expert in survey research?
               MR. SILFER: Are you done with your
7
    question?
                MR. EDELL:
                MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of
10
   the question. You don't have to take anything
11
    from Mr. Edell. If you know he is right, that's
    fine. If you don't, you don't have to accept it.
          On the assumption that what you said is
14
    true, I don't know what the reason could be.
15
    There could be many reasons.
                                  I just don't know.
                Have you ever conducted a study where
17
          Q.
    the focus of the study, the subject itself, was
18
    not disclosed up front and that the questions
19
    concerning that subject were intermingled among
20
    really unrelated questions?
21
                MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
22
  the question. You can answer.
          Not where the question is dealing with the
   iprime subject was intermingled among others.
```

```
110
  D. Neadle - direct
1 have conducted studies where in the initial
2 introductory questions that we did not reveal the
  subject of the study.
               Looking again at Neadle Exhibit 12,
         Q.
  could you turn to the third page, please. There
   are handwritten numbers listed under the little
   box where it says 31-2.
         Yes.
              What's the significance of those
         ٥.
   numbers?
         In order to answer that question, I would
   need a copy of our master code sheet.
               What does it look like? I tried to
13
   put together all the materials that were furnished
  to me by Mr. Silfen.
         It would be a copy of the questionnaire like
17 this with a lot of notations numerically along the
    way, column notations and notations as to
  regarding what all the various columns were for.
               That doesn't appear in any of the
          Q.
20
21 reports that you prepared?
                MR. SILFEN: I'm not sure I understand
22
23 the question. You mean in the documents that you
```

MR. EDELL: No. In any of the

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

put here?

25

;	D. Neadle - direct
1	reports. I only was furnished with two reports.
2	Q. Are there more reports than these two?
3	MR. EDELL: I produced all the reports
4	you gave me, Mr. Silfen.
5	- MR. SILFEN: He hasn't said that the
6	master coding document is in the reports. He just
7	said that it exists and I know it was in the
8	documents that we gave you so if you don't have
9	it, it's because you didn't bring it.
10	A. It was a separate document not in a report.
11	Q. What does it look like, sir?
12	A. It looks like a questionnaire.
13	Q. It has handwritten notes on it?
14	A. Right, with column designations and
15	instruction designations as to what questions are
16	asked of which respondents and it should include
17	designations as to what information is being put
18	down here in these columns.
19	Q. When you say what questions are asked
20	of what respondents, I thought that all the
2 1	questions appear on the questionnaire. Is that
22	not right?
	A. All of the questions appear on the
24	questionnaire, yes, that's correct.

- D. Needle direct
- 1 interviewee?
- 2 A. The questions on the respondent selection
- 3 form are not asked of each respondent. A
- 4 respondent is asked one question out of ten
- 5 questions that appear here.
- 6 Q. Out of the ten questions that appear
- 7 on the first page under B. Is that what you are
- 8 saying?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- 10 Q. It's your testimony that there's a
- 11 | master code that tells you what questions should
- 12 be asked of what respondents?
- 13 A. The instructions tell you which one but that
- 14 master code sheet will have code designations for
- 15 the computer to indicate how the computer is going
- 16 to recognize it since the computer doesn't read
- 17 the words.
- 18 Q. Without that code sheet, you can't
- 19 identify what the numbers mean on the right-hand
- 20 side of the bottom of the third page. Is that
- 21 right?
- 22 : A. That's right. I don't recall specifically
- 23 what they were without that master code sheet.
- 24 Q. Let's take a look at the report, the
- 25 final report, which has been marked as Neadle

2017010959

- D. Needle direct
- 1 : Exhibit 10. Did you have a column current
- 2 cigarette smokers, first page of the tabular
- 3 · results?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Under causes cancer, it has 9.6. Does
- 6 that mean 9.6 of the current emokers? Is that
- 7 wrong?
- 8 A. I'm sorry. I don't follow you.
- 9: Q. I thought there's a column on the
- 10 left-hand side where it says causes lung cancer.
- 11 : A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Do you see that?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. If you carry it across to current
- 18 cigarette smokers, is there a percentage there?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 MR. SILFEN: You said causes cancer.
- 18 Q. I'm sorry. Causes lung cancer.
- 19 A. That means 9.6 percent of all current
- 20 | cigarette smokers gave a response that was
- 21 categorized as causes lung cancer to question one
- 22 you have a percentage of 58.8 under current
- 23 cigarette emokers for the column on the side of
- 24 negative health effects. Is that right?
- 25 A. Regative health effects net, that's correct.

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- Q. What does that mean, negative health
- 3 A. That means that that's all the people who
- 4 made one or more mentions of a comment indicating
- 5 a negative health effect in response to question
- 6 : one and the 58.5 percent is the percentage of
- 7 current digarette emokers who in effect said that,
- 8 meaning 58.5 percent of current digarette emokers
- 9 ; made one or more statements in response to
- 10 question one that indicated that their response
- 11 was categorized as a negative health effect. They
- 12 could have made more than one but at least one.
- 13 Q. Would you tell se what statements were
- 14 included in the negative health effects net
- 15 column?
- 16 A. The first nine categories starting with
- 17 causes lung cancer so it would be causes lung
- 18 cancer, causes other types of cancer, causes
- 19 cancer general, shortens life, kills, causes other
- 20 diseases, affects health. I have to count down.
- 21 Well, excuse me. Am I supposed to be writing on
- 22 this exhibit now? I was making notes to count
- 23 down.
- Q. If you are numbering all of those --
- 25 A. All I was doing was numbering.

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 Q. That's okay. As long as we know what
- 2 you are doing. You are numbering on the left-hand
- 3 column the first nine negative mentions, is it?
- 4 : A. The first nine categories starting with
- 5 : causes lung cancer.
- 6 Q. So that would include causes of lung
- 7 cancer, causes of other types.
- 8 A. Not of. Causes lung cancer, causes other
- 9 types of cancer, causes cancer general, shortens
- 10 life, kills, causes other diseases, affects
- 11 health, addictive, habit-forming, like a drug, the
- 12 | next one is know people who died or got diseases
- 13 because of smoking, the next one is polluting
- 14 other health-related effects, and the last one is
- 15 bad, dangerous to health general. Those are the
- 16 nine categories that are included in the negative
- 17 health effects net.
- 18 Q. Did you add those nine up, you would
- 19 get 58.57
- 20 A. No. You would probably get a minimum of
- 21 58.5 but probably more.
- 22 Q. Because come people have more than one
- 23 negative thing to say about the health aspect of
- 24 'cigarettes. Is that right?
- 25 A. That's correct.

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- Q. In terms of negative mentions of, when you say negative mentions on this thing, what does that mean?
- 4 A. That would include the negative health 5 effects plus expensive, costly, emokers are
- 6 crazy/idiots, never want to smoke, public has been
- 7 made aware of dangers to health, more should be
- 8 done to discourage smoking. It goes through all
- 9 | of the responses down to all other negative
- 10 mentions on the second page.
- 11 Q. In the left-hand column on the first
- 12 page of these tabular results, it has expensive,
- 13 costly, 12.5 percent of current smokers mention
- 14 that as a negative mention.
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. As opposed to 9.6 mentioned causes
- 17 | lung cancer as a negative mention. Is that
- 18 | correct?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. So more people made negative
- 21 statements in terms of expense and costliness than
- 22 they did with regard to causes lung cancer. Is
- 23 that right?
- 24 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 25 the question. You may answer.

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 A. More current smokers said expensive, costly
- 2 than specifically said causes lung cancer but
- 3 ! there are other types of cancer included.
- 4 Q. Of the causes other types of cancer,
- 5 | .5 for current emokers?
- 6 A. Right, and causes cancer in general, 15.3.
- 7 Q. Can one interpret this data as those
- & statements for which one receives a higher
- 9 percentage or things that smokers are more
- 10 concerned about than those for which you receive a
- 11 | lower percentage?
- 12 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 13 the question.
- 14 A. Would you repeat that?
- 15 . Q. Let me see if I can make it more
- 16 intelligible. For example, causes lung cancer,
- 17 | you have 9.6 percent of the people making that
- is statement when you read the first question to
- 19 them.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. What I'm trying to find out is whether
- 22 or not smokers are more concerned with the expense
- 23 of cigarettes as opposed to causes lung cancer
- 24 because you get a higher percentage listing
- 25 expensive, costly as a negative mention as opposed

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 to causes lung cancer.
- 2 A. I would say my interpretation of it would be
- 3 'exectly the opposite.
 - Q. Why is that?
- 5 : A. Because the fact that it causes lung cancer
- 5 is a very specific, expensive, costly is the only
- 7 category we have dealing with the whole cost
- 8 situation so that means a total of 12.5 percent of
- 9 current emokers mentioned anything to do with cost
- 10 or expense. We have causes cancer net for current
- 11 cigarette emokers of 25 percent, which is
- 12 | approximately double the percent who said anything
- 13 . about expense and that's just specific mentions of
- 14 cancer. There are also people who, another 19
- 15 percent said causes other diseases, meaning or
- 16 three percent said it shortens life, meaning they,
- 17 I don't know if they were talking about cancer or
- 18 not. They didn't specifically say the word cancer
- 19 but at least 25.1 percent of them specifically
- 20 mentioned the word cancer.
- 21 Q. How do you get the net, the subnet
- 22 eignificant figure for causes cancer in current
- 23 smokers?
- 24 A. That's the number of people who said one or
- 25 more of the following: Causes lung cancer, causes

```
119
   D. Neadle - direct
   other types of cancer, causes in general.
                Do you add those columns up?
2
             You don't add them. It's the number of
   people who said one or more of those things. They
   are only counted once even if they said it three
    times.
               Turn to the second page.
7
    you that, why did you have a subnet of causes
   cancer and you didn't have a subset of causes
                           .......
                . -urw i Know what you mean.
   other diseases was all one category. In the
   interest of getting as much detail as possible, we
    broke cancer mentions up into different types of
    cancer mentions but felt it would be of interest
    to know how many people use the term cancer
   specifically, regardless of whether they might
17
    have used it twice, so since you can't add that up
    to find out, when we broke it up into three
19
    categories, we also designed it to produce a net
20
    of how many people mentioned it at least once.
                When you say mentions it --
22
          Mentions cancer in response to the question,
    "When I mention cigarettes, what comes to your
```

25 mind?"

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 Q. That reflects awareness, not belief.
- 2 Right, eir?
- MR. SILFEM: Objection to the form of
- 4 the question.
- 5 A. No. It doesn't reflect awareness or belief
- 6 specifically. It reflects what the term
- 7 | "cigarettes" generates in people's minds.
- 4 Q. The 25 percent for current smokers,
- 9 | for causes cancer, that doesn't mean that 25
- 10 percent of the current emokers that were surveyed
- 11 thought that digarette smoking causes cancer. Is
- 12 that right?
- 13 A. It means that that's a thought that the term
- 14 "cigarettee" generates in their mind.
- 15 Q. If somebody responded by saying I
- 16 heard that cigarette smoking causes cancer, would
- 17 they be included in causes cancer?
- 18 A. Yes, they would.
- 19 Q. So it could be either somebody was
- 20 aware of a statement that digarette emoking caused
- 21 cancer or someone believed that digarette smoking
- 22 | caused cancer. Is that correct?
- 23 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 24 the question.
- 25 A. It could mean both of those things. It

```
D. Neadle - direct
    could mean other things as well. It could mean
    that the term digarettes generates the thought of
    cancer in their minds.
          Q.
                What else could it mean other than the
    respondent either believes that cigarette smoking
    causes cancer or heard that digarette emoking
    causes cancer?
          There could be people who really haven't
    made up their minds on it but they associate the
    term.
                Where is that broken out as to people
11
          Q.
    who are undecided on the issue of cigarette
12
    smoking and cancer?
          It's not within the framework of this
    question.
                You didn't think it was important to
16
    break out the people who were decided on the issue
17
    who thought digarette emoking caused cancer or
   not?
19
20
                MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
21
    the question.
          The purpose of this question was to find out
    as I said or determine what does the term
   cigarettes generate in people's minds, what
```

25 ! thoughts, what concepts. That's broken out here.

D.	M 0 4	dI	-	d 1	Fe	e	ŧ

have 25.1 percent.

Q. Let me make sure I understand. On the tabular results under causes cancer subnet, you

Correct?

- 4 : A. Por current cigarette emokers.
- 9 Cancer, I heard cigarettes cause cancer or I
- haven't decided whether cigarette emoking causes
 cancer. Is that right?
- 12 A. The 25.1 percent would include among current
 13 cigarette smokers people who made each of those
 14 types of statements.
- Q. What percentage of the 25.1 percent of current emokers who are characterized as having responded "causes cancer" stated that they believed that digarette emoking caused cancer?
- Q. How many of those people said they
 were undecided as to whether or not cigarette
 smoking caused cancer?
- 23 A. I don't know.

19

I don't know.

Q. How many people simply said I'm aware that people say that cigarette smoking causes

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 | cancer?
- 2 A. I don't know.
- Q. Would your answer be the same with
- 4 regard to causes lung cancer, that there would be
- 5 people included in that category as being
- 6 ; undecided as to whether or not cigarette smoking
- 7 : causes lung cancer? Again we are looking at the
- 8 current digarette smokers, 9.6 percent.
- 9 A. I don't know if there would be people in
- 10 there who said that, but if somebody did say it,
- 11 they would be there.
- 12 · Q. If somebody said, "I believe cigarette
- 13 smoking causes lung cancer," they would be in that
- 14 : category also?
- 15 A. That's correct.,
- 16 Q. If somebody said, "I heard that
- 17 cicarette emoking causes lung cancer," they would
- 18 be in that category also?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. You didn't think it was necessary to
- 21 break those three responses out. Is that correct?
- 22 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 23 the question.
- 24 A. I did not think it was necessary for the
- 25 purposes of the study, no.

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

Q. Did you discuss the question of breaking those three different responses out, undecided, I believe it causes or I heard that it causes, with Arnold & Forter or Shook, Hardy & Bacon or Jones, Day?

6 A. No, I did not.

Q. Why?

7

20

21

24

8 MR. SILPEN: Objection to the form of the question.

10 A. I and my staff set up all of these

Q. Do you know what percentage of the

25.1 percent of current smokers who fall into the

category "Causes cancer" were undecided as to

whether or not cigarette smoking caused cancer?

MR. SILTEN: Hold it. You've asked

him that question. If you haven't, inform me but

it's my clear impression that you asked him that

question already. Why are you asking it again?

MR. EDELL: Maybe it just elipped my mind. Mr. Silfen.

MR. SILFEN: Don't ask him again.

23 Don't answer that question.

MR. EDELL: Are you directing him not

25 to answer the question?

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 MR. SILFEN: If you are going to
- 2 represent to me that you haven't asked it before,
- 3 I'll let you ask it, but your answer seemed to be
- 4; that it slipped your mind.
- 5 MR. EDELL: I didn't think that I did
- 6 but unlike you, I make mistakes at times. I'm
- 7 just trying to get a response to the question on
- 8 the outside chance that even if you are right, we
- 9 do have a complete transcript here.
- 10 MR. SILFEN: On the outside chance,
- 11 Mr. Neadle, did you break down the 25.1 between
- 12 undecideds and other categories?
- 13 MR. EDELL: That wasn't my question.
- 14 MR. SILFEN: Ask your question.
- 15 : MR. EDELL: Could you repeat 1t,
- 16 please.
- 17 ! (Question read.)
- 18 A. No, I do not no.
- 19 Q. Turn to page four. My copy is not
- 20 that good of this, of these tabular results.
- 21 Let's take, for example, the column current
- 22 snokers, responsibilities providing an estimate of
- 23 one to ten years in the left-hand side of the
- 24 page. Do you see that?
- 25 A. It's not one to ten years.

- D. Neadle direct
- Q. What is that?
- 2 A. It's one to ten out of 100 cigarette
- 3 smokers.

- Q. I'm sorry. The left-hand column says

 one to ten digarette sackers will develop lung

 cancer from their smoking. Is that correct?
- MR. SILPEN: What?
- Q. Is that what that means, one to ten?
- 9 A. It means that respondents in that row are
- 10 people who said something between one and ten in
- 11 response to the question of among 100 cigarette
- 12 smokers.
- 13 Q. Out of 100 digarette emokers, the
- 14 people in that row said one to ten people will get
- 15 | lung cancer. Is that correct?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. If we look under current smokers, we
- 18 have a figure of 23.2 percent of current smokers
- 19 said between one and ten smokers out of a hundred
- 20 smokers will get lung cancer. Is that right?
- 21 A. Because they emoke.
- Q. Because they smoke?
- 23 A. Right.
- Q. Of that 23.2 percent, how many people
- 25 said they knew that fact and how many people said

- D. Neadle direct
- 1 they guessed at that?
- 2 A. We didn't ask that question.
- Q. How many people responded to that
- 4 question to the second part of that question, "If
- 5. don't know, just your best guess will do"?
- 6 A. We have no record of that.
- 7 Q. So you don't know how many of those
- \$ 23.2 percent of current emokers are just giving
- 9 the interviewer their response, "I don't know but
- 10 I'm giving you my best guess." Is that correct?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 Q. In your opinion if a respondent
- 13 | indicates that they don't know but they give you a
- 14 guess, that reflects the respondent's beliefs with
- 15 respect to cigarette smoking and disease?
- 16 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 17 the question. You may answer.
- 18 A. Not disease in general. Lung cancer
- 19 specifically.
- 20 Q. So if the respondent for the purposes
- 21 of this survey said that they didn't know how many
- 22 emokers out of 100 cigarette emokers would develop
- 23 lung cancer but made a guess at it, you think that
- 24 that reflects their belief with respect to
- 25 cigarette smoking and lung cancer. Is that right?

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- MR. SILVEN: Objection to the form of
- 2 the question.
- 3 A. In response to a question of how many do you
- 4 think, some respondents interpret the question as
- 5 wanting a very specific kind of answer to an exact
- 5 digit and they say I don't know. The probe of
- 7 just your best guess will do in fact informs them
- s that a rounded number is in fact acceptable and I
- 9 | believe it reflects their belief.
- 10; Q. How do you know that the respondent
- 11 has no idea and is just giving an off-handed
- 12 number?
- 13 MR. SILFEN: Objection to the form of
- 14 the guestion.
- 15 A. Those respondents, I believe that those
- 16 respondents who have no idea said that and are not
- 17 included in this tabulation.
- 18 Q. So if I was being interviewed and I
- 19 said I don't know, I have no idea how many, the
- 20 instructions were that the interviewer was to say
- 21 well, just give me your best guess?
- 22 A. The interviewer's instructions were to ask
- 23 for your best guess. If you responded to that I
- 24 don't know or I can't make a guess or words to
- 25 that effect, that was the final response.

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- I understand that but if I answered 1 the first question, "Among 100 digarette smokers how many of them do you think will get lung cancer | because they smoke," by saying I have no idea, the instructions to the interviewer were that they 5 | should say well, just give me your best guess. that right?
- We have been all over MR. SILFEN: You've asked him that three times. What do you want?
 - Is that right? Q.
- Just your best guess will do. 12
- And, therefore, if that same person 1.3 said in response to, "Just your best guess will do, " 20, then that would be recorded. Correct?
- That's correct. 16

19

20

21

- MR. EDELL: Would you please mark 17 18 these, please.
 - (Neadle Exhibit 13 and 14 marked for identification.)
- Mr. Neadle, I show you two documents, the first of which has been marked Meadle Exhibit 22 13, which is, it appears to me and you'll correct me, I'm sure, if I'm wrong, to be -- well, I won't even characterize it. I show you two different

- D. Needle direct
- 1 | tabular results of your survey. Can you explain
- 2 to me what each one contains.
- 3 A. Neadle Exhibit 13 are the tabulations of the
- 4 | results to the survey on an unweighted raw
- 5 respondent count basis.
- Q. What is number 147
- 7 A. Number 14 is a copy of the weighted
- & : projected tabulations prior to final edits.
- 9 | Included on it are some pencil notations in my
- 10 , handwriting of results to the first wave of the
- 11 pilot study and also some unweighted numbers.
- 12: Q. The tabular results in the report that
- 13 , you furnished to Arnold & Porter, those are
- 14 | weighted? Is that correct?
- 15 A. Weighted and projected results.
- 16 Q. What do you mean by projected?
- 17 A. They are projected to the total
- 18 non-institutionalized population of the United
- 19 States aged 16 and older living in households in
- 20 the coterminus United States.
- 21 MR. EDELL: Would you mark that,
- 22 Dlease.
- 23 : (Neadle Exhibit 15 and 16 marked for
- 24 | identification.)
- 25 : Q. Can you tell me what Neadle Exhibit 15

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 16, 6177
- 2 A. It's a copy of the final survey
- 3 | questionnaire which was used as a coding master.
- 4 : Q. Is that what we were referring to
- 5 previously?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Now that you have that, can you
- & explain to me what the numbers are that appear on
- 9 some of the other questionnaires on page three? I
- 10 believe it was right underneath the box where it
- 11 says 31-1 and 31-2.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. What are they?
- 14 A. The first digit, there were, I believe, four
- 15 digite.
- 16 Q. You are referring to which exhibit
- 17 | now?
- 18 A. In Exhibit 11, there were four digits below
- 19 the box you signified showing 31-102. The first
- 20 of those digits refers to a code for the
- 21 respondent's sex, male or female. The next three
- 22 refer to the location or what we call PSU, primary
- 23 | sampling unit.
- 24 Q. Tell me what Neadle Exhibit 16 is.
- 25 A. (Examining document.) A copy of a code

```
132
    D. Neadle - direct
    sheet used by our coding department.
                                           I can't tell
    from this whether it's the final version or
 2
    intermediate version.
                Who's Lee Frankel?
          He is executive vice-president of Audits &
    Surveys.
 7
          ٥.
                What work did he do on the study?
          He supervised the overall sampling design
    used and was responsible for the computations of
10
    the sampling errors shown in the technical
    appendix to the report.
11
                Why did he work on it?
12
          Because he is a world-reknowned sampling
13
    statistician and it's in his area of
14
    epecialization.
15
                Did you rely upon his work?
16
17
          I certainly do.
                In this case, in this survey did you
18
    rely upon his work?
19
20
          Yes.
                MR. EDELL: Let's take a short break.
21
    I'll ask the court reporter to mark some documents
22
    that I have no idea what they are.
23
                 (Neadle Exhibits 15 to 30 marked for
24
```

identification.)

25

```
D. Neadle - direct
 1
                Mr. Weadle, before I forget, you told
 2
    us that Neadle 10 for identification was prepared
    you think sometime in early 1986, is it, sir?
 3
 5
                When did you furnish it to counsel?
          I would assume shortly after it was
. 7
    prepared.
                            Mr. Silfen, if that is the
                MR. EDELL:
 9
    expert's report, can I understand or get an
    understanding from you as to why we weren't
10
11
    previously furnished with that as his report as
    opposed to this one-page summary in this case? We
12
    are entitled to all the reports furnished to you
13
    by your experts.
14
15
                MR. SILFEN: Was this expert
    designated?
16
17
                MR. EDELL:
                             Months ago as I understand
18
    it.
                              This expert?
                MR. SILPEN:
19
                MR. EDELL:
20
                MR. SILPEN:
                              This expert was
21
22
    designated as one of the people that was in
    response to your last wave so it wasn't months
23
    200.
          Whenever it was.
                MR. EDELL: It was at the very
25
```

```
D. Neadle - direct
    beginning of September.
 2
                MR. SILPEN:
                             Three months ago?
 3
                MR. EDELL:
                            We are at the end of this
    month.
                MR. SILPEM:
                             Let's find out when it
          This this gentleman was designated sometime
 7
    in September. You got his underlying work product
    in time to be ready for his deposition. If you
    have some other complaints, you know where to go
10
    with it.
                MR. EDELL:
                            Two weeks before the
11
    deposition, Mr. Silfen, under subpoens to obtain
12
    those things that he relied upon.
13
                MR. SILFEN: If you have a complaint,
14
    I don't know what you'ere gaining by airing it
1.5
    here on the record. I don't agree with your
16
17
               We have a difference of opinion.
    can do what you will.
18
                MR. EDELL:
19
                            I just want to find out
    whether there was any basis for your opinion.
20
                I show you what has been marked Neadle
21
    Exhibit 17 for identification. Can you tell me
22
    what that 107
23
24
          Meadle 17 appears to be the results to the
    first wave of the pilot study for question one and
```

```
D. Neadle - direct
    question two.
                Can you tell me what Meadle Exhibit 18
    is, please?
          It is the results to question one from the
    first wave of the pilot study with pencil
    notations of preliminary results to question 1
 7
    from the main study.
                What's the number of respondents
    listed on Neadle Exhibit 19 in the penciled-in
10
    notes?
11
          Needle Exhibit 187
12
                Yes.
          Q.
          3,508.
13
                Neadle Exhibit 19, what's that?
14
          It is the results to question one from the
15
    first wave of the pilot study with preliminary
18
    results from the main study penciled in.
17
                Did those penciled-in notes on Neadle
18
19
    19 precede the notes that you made on 18?
          I would assume so, since it doesn't have the
20
21
    full base of respondents.
                Tell us what Weadle Exhibit 20 is,
22
```

20 appears to be the results to question

three from the first wave of the pilot study.

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

23

24

please.

- Q. Tell us what Neadle Exhibit 21 is,
- 2 please.
- 3 A. This is Weadle Exhibit 21, correct?
- Q. Yes.
- 5 A. Weadle Exhibit 21 appears to be a marginal
- 6 tabulation of the results to the full-scale study
- 7 prior to final editing.
- 5 Q. What are do the columns signify where
- 9 it says 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 0, X and T?
- 10 A. That's the identification of the possible
- 11 punches in an IBM 80-column card. Each column has
- 12 a potential for 12 punches that are designated one
- 13 through O, X and Y.
- 14 Q. Do these particular columns have any
- 15 significance, though, in terms of what they
- 16 represent other than identifying some, I don't
- 17 know how would you would describe it, IBM punch
- 18 cards or whatever it is?
- 19 A. An IBM punch card, standard IBM punch card
- 20 is 80 columns wide and 12 punches deep. The
- 21 | punches are signified as 1 through 0, X and Y. It
- 22 | just identifies the number that you are indicating
- 23 as the result or the identification in a
- 24 | particular column.
- 25 Q. I'm not going to understand it.

- D. Neadle direct
- anyway. Meadle Exhibit 27.
- 2 A. Sorry.
- g. It's not your fault. That's my fault.
- 4 A. Neadle Exhibit 27, that is one page of a
- 5 cleaning editing document from our computer
- 6 indicating questionnaires that have something
- 7 that's inconsistent with the instructions. It
- a then has pencil notes by Doris Carella, our coding
- supervisor, on what should be done to clarify the
- 10 | computer stated irregularity.
 - Q. What does skill signify?
- 12 A. Column eight reject.
- 13 Q. What information is in column eight?
- 14 Do you have to go back to the master code? I'm
- 15 getting a hang of it, at least to a certain
- 16 extent.

- 17 A. Column eight is a question to be asked in
- 18 households where there are exactly two persons age
- 19 16 and older and the question reade: "Is the
- 20 older member of the household male or female?"
- 21 Q. What's Weadle Exhibit 28, sir?
- 22 A. Readle Exhibit 28 is a copy of notes made by
- 23 Mendy Kreisberg, the project director, in a
- 24 conversation with the interviewing supervisor
- 25 regarding her briefing of the interviewing staff

```
138
    D. Neadle - direct
 1
    to work on this study.
 2.
                Can you read her note?
 3
          "Briefing last evening. Briefing went
    well. Listened to interviews on phones." I can't
    read the next line.
                         The Kerox ien't quite good
             Decision made, something supervisor
    controlled sample. That is, supervisor will add
    new numbers and I can't read the next line on this
    Xerox.
10
                How long are the interviews, telephone
11
    interviews?
          For this particular study?
12
13
          Q.
          I would imagine that the study didn't
14
    require, once a respondent was selected and on the
16
    phone, more than five minutes.
17
                What's Neadle Exhibit 29?
18
          It is a preliminary set of tabulations to
19
    the full-scale study.
20
                When you say preliminary, what do you
21
    mean, sir? Is that non-weighted and
22
    non-projected?
```

Mon-weighted, non-projected and prior to the

What's cleaning and edits?

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

final cleaning and edits.

23

25

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 A. It's a quality control step to insure that
- 2 | all the interviewers follow their instructions on
- 3 each questionnaire and that there are no
- 4 interviewing errors.
- 5 Q. I show you what has been marked Neadle
- 6 Exhibit 30.
- 7 A. (Examining document.) It's a lot of
- 8 introductory pages from a computer program. The
- 9 key information is on the final page. It's from
- 10 running, it's a tabulation of a data tape from the
- 11 | current population survey of 1984 providing
- 12 estimates of the total U.S. household population
- 13 in the coterminus United States by age, by sex, by
- 14 census regions.
- 15 NR. EDELL: Would you mark thie,
- 16 please.
- 17 (Neadle Exhibit 31 marked for
- 18 | identification.)
- 19 Q. I show you what has been marked Neadle
- 20 Exhibit 31, which is your "report" furnished by
- 21 counsel for the defendants. Have you ever seen
- 22 that before. eir?
- 23 A. I saw it a couple of days ago.
- 24 Q. Tell me in regard to paragraph one
- 28 what "to which surveys and polls can be properly

```
D. Neadle - direct
```

- 1 | put means.
- 2 A. Surveys and polls?
- 3 Q. Surveys and polls.
- 4 A. To determine what?
- 5 Q. I don't know, sir. It's your report.
- 6 A. I'm sorry. I'm asking you a question.
- 7 Q. What I'm trying to do is get a little
- 8 bit more elaboration on what your opinions are in
- 9 this matter. This is supposed to be a summary of
- 10 your opinions and the basis for your opinions. I
- 11 don't think we have to go into any great detail
- 12 with regard to the survey because now I have your
- 13 report that you furnished to Arnold & Porter and
- 14 the other lawyers as well as the underlying data,
- 15 so I still need to ask you some questions in order
- 16 that I have a full appreciation of what you are
- 17 really going to testify to or what opinions you
- 18 hold so I want to know what "uses to which surveys
- 19 and polls can be properly put" means.
- 20 MR. SILPEN: It doesn't sound like a
- 21 question. If you heard what you are saying, Marc,
- 22 | you'd realize that it doesn't sound like a
- 23 question. Believe me.
- 24 MR. EDELL: Okay. Then I'll try it
- 25 again.

D. Neadle - direct

5

10

11

19

20

1 MR. SILPEN: Ask him what that
2 sentence means, whether he is going to offer an
3 opinion other than the survey that he has put on
4 the table here and we'll get out of here.

MR. EDELL: Sure.

- Q. What did you mean by the phrase, "uses to which surveys and polls can be properly put"?
- A. I was referring to the particular survey that's been marked here in all its parts.
 - Q. This survey and this poll. Is that what you are talking about, eir?
- 12 A. Right, and in effect what it says.
- 13 Q. You are not going to testify as to
 14 what any other survey or any other poll can be
 15 used for. Is that right?
- 16 A. I can't tell what I'm going to be asked. I
 17 haven't looked at any other surveys or polls on
 18 this subject to analyse.
 - MR. EDELL: Can I have an indication from you, Mr. Silfen, so we don't waste time.
- 21 MR. SILFEN: You got the seme 22 indication from me that you've given to us. Mr.
- 23 | Neadle hasn't been asked to look at any other poll
- 24 at this time. As his report stands now, it
- 25 applies only to this poll, he has answered you

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

D. Neadle - direct

properly, that he doesn't know what he is going to

be asked to do at trial but right now if you ask

him about any other poll he won't be able to

answer you because he hasn't done anything else.

- Q. Certainly the statement in your report doesn't seem to limit itself to the survey and poll that you performed in this matter and I just want to be sure that that's the only survey and only poll upon which you are going to express any opinions or you have any opinions presently concerning its proper use. Is that correct?

 A. This survey is the only one that presently I can talk about within this case because it's the only one I've looked at or seen or had anything to do with.
- Q. Tell me all the uses for which one can use your survey, of course properly.
 - A. One can use it to determine the awareness of the general public with regard to the issue of smoking and health, to what degree the public is aware of communications about linking emoking to bad health, and the degree to which the general public feels emoking causes lung cancer. It can also be used in terms of the first question to indicate what the term cigarettes brings to

- D. Needle direct
- 1 people's minds, both in terms of negative and 2 positive mentions or neutral mentions.
- Q. Do you see the sentence, the last
 4 sentence in paragraph one on Neadle Exhibit 31,
- 5 "Mr. Meadle will also be prepared to testify about
- 6 levels of awareness which are generally
- 7 demonstrable on matters presumed to be widespread
- 8 public information and to compare those levels of
- 9 awareness to levels of awareness with respect to
- 10 the potential health hazards of smoking"? Would
- 11 | you tell us what those levels of awareness are and
- 12 with regard to what hazarde?
- 13 A. I don't see anything about hazards in here.
- 14 The potential health risks of emoking is the
- 15 current study. As far as anything else goes, as I
- 16 said, I haven't looked at any other studies and,
- 17 therefore, I can't testify about them.
- 18 Q. What subjects are you going to testify
- 19 to concerning other levels of awareness other than
- 20 levels of awareness dealing with cigarette smoking
- 21 and health?
- 22 A. I can't tell what I'm going to be asked. At
- 23 | the moment I haven't looked at any others and,
- 24 therefore, I'm not prepared to testify about any
- 25 others.

405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07052

D. Neadle - direct

- 1 As we sit here today, you have no 2 opinion concerning levels of awareness which are generally desonstrable on matters presumed to be widespread public information and you can't compare those levels of awareness to levels of
- awareness regarding digarette emoking and
- 7 disease. Is that right?
 - THE WITNESS: Could you repeat that.
- 9 (Question read.)
- Not on any specific matters. 10
- Can you tell me any general matters, 11
- 12 then?
- 13 Just that I believe that the levels of
- awareness shown in this study are extremely high
- relative to in general what I've observed in other 15
- 16 studies.
- What other studies? 17
- Many others for many clients. 18
- What other studies? 19
- 20 Studies of brand awareness and advertising
- 21 awareness for many clients.
- I want a specific study, sir, and if 22
- you are relying upon them, I was entitled to
- receive them in advance of this deposition, so let
- me know what they are specifically so that counsel

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters

D.	Nes	dle	-	dir	est
----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----

- can identify them and furnish them to me in case
- 2 | we have to take another deposition.
- 3 A. I guess I don't understand.
- 4 MR. SILFEN: No wants to know if you
- 5 are relying on any specific study to make your
- & statement that you thought the levels here were
- 7 generally high.
- 8 A. There's no specific study. Just in general
- 9 many studies that I have read about and/or
- 10 | conducted.
- 11 Q. What studies?
- 12 A. I can't name them.
- 13 Q. What studies have you conducted that
- 14 you are referring to?
- 15 A. I have conducted literally hundreds of
- 16 studies. I'm not sure. I conducted studies for
- 17 many different clients. These data are the
- 18 clients' property. I can't produce them.
- 19 Q. What's the widespread public
- 20 information that you refer to in that sentence?
- 21 A. My general recollection of articles I've
- 22 seen about published polls.
- 23 Q. What public information are you
- 24 referring to? You are talking about widespread
- 25 public information and you can compare that with

```
D. Weadle - direct
```

- 1 regard to other subjects to digarette excking and
- 2 disease and I want to know what widespread public
- 3 information you are referring to.
- 4 A. I can't give you any specifics. That's my
- S impression of the published polls that I've seen.
- 6 Q. Published polls on what subject?
- 7 A. On many, many different subjects. In the
- a literature I read lote of articles about polls.
- 9 I've seen lote of poll results. I can't specify a
- 10 | epecific one.
- 11 Q. You can't recall any specific poll
- 12 that deals with "widespread public information" to
- 13 which you are going to compare the awareness of
- 14 cigarette smoking and disease?
- 5 A. At the moment, no.
- 16 Q. Did you ever inform anyone that you
- 17 were going to express an opinion or that you had
- is an opinion regarding levels of awareness which are
- 19 | generally demonstrable on matters presumed to be
- 20 widespread public information and that you were
- 21 going to compare those levels of awareness to
- 22 levels of awareness with respect to the potential
- 29 health risks of smoking?
- 24 A. I haven't studied any of the other, any
- 25 other studies to compare with.

D. Weadle - direct MR. EDELL: Could you read the question back to the witness. (Question read.) A. Only if I studied some other research. Q. Which you haven't done? A. That's correct. MR. EDELL: No further questions. (Deposition concluded at 3:30 p.m.)	
question back to the witness. (Question read.) A. Only if I studied some other research. Q. Which you haven't done? A. That's correct. MR. EDELL: No further questions. (Deposition concluded at 3:30 p.m.)	
(Question read.) A. Only if I studied some other research. Q. Which you haven't done? A. That's correct. MR. EDELL: No further questions. (Deposition concluded at 3:30 p.m.)	,
A. Only if I studied some other research. Q. Which you haven't done? A. That's correct. MR. EDELL: No further questions. (Deposition concluded at 3:30 p.m.)	;
Q. Which you haven't done? A. That's correct. MR. EDELL: No further questions. (Deposition concluded at 3:30 p.m.)	-
6 A. That's correct. 7 MR. EDELL: No further questions. 6 (Deposition concluded at 3:30 p.m.) 9	:
7 MR. EDELL: No further questions. 8 (Deposition concluded at 3:30 p.m.) 9	
(Deposition concluded at 3:30 p.m.)	į
	;
	,
·	•
10	
11	,
12	
19	
14	
15	
16	
17	
15	
19	
20	
21	
22	-
29	
24	
25	

1 JURAT 2 I, DEXTER MEADLE, do hereby certify 3 stimony, taken on October 26, 1987, and have eigned it subject to the following changes: PAGE LINE CORRECTION 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 DATE: 20 21 Sworn and subscribed to before me on this day 22 of NOTARY PUBLIC 23 24 25 waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters 405 Northfield Avenue West Orange, N. J. 07082 201-731-9666

CERTIFICATE

I, MARGARET J. TEILHABER, a Certified
Shorthand Reporter and Motary Public of the States
of New York and New Jersey, do hereby certify that
prior to the commencement of the examination the
witness was sworn by me to testify the truth, the
whole truth and nothing but the truth.

I do further certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I do further certify that I am neither of counsel nor attorney for any party in this action and that I am not interested in the event nor outcome of this litigation.

Notary Public of the States of N

Certificate Number X100856

New Jersey consission expires August 7, 1991

New York registration No. 6741157 New York commission expires February 1990

waga and spinelli certified shorthand reporters